



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL  
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL  
LIBRARY



From the collection  
of the  
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL  
SOCIETY











A  
**DISCUSSION**  
OF  
**THE SUBJECT OF UNIVERSALISM,**

HELD IN

LAPORT, LORAIN COUNTY, OHIO;

*From July 29th, to August 6th, 1845:*

BETWEEN

**REV. N. DOOLITTLE,**  
*Universalist Minister of Akron, Ohio.*

AND

**REV. JOHN H. POWER,**  
*Methodist Minister of Delaware, Ohio*

REPORTED BY

**MR. A. A. WHETMORE,** *Oberlin Ohio.*

AND REVISED BY THE PARTIES.

---

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

*Tribune Office Print.*

1846.

BX  
9946  
D7

CERTIFICATE.

Having carefully examined this discussion, as taken down by the Reporter, and compared it with our notes, &c. We say to the public that it is a fair and full exhibition of the arguments, facts, and documents used by us on the questions discussed.

NELSON DOOLITTLE.  
JOHN H. POWER.

---

*Entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1846, by*  
REV. J. S. POWER  
*In the Clerk's office for the District Court of Ohio.*

---

1165  
24

## PREFACE.

In presenting the following Debate to the public, I deem it proper to mention, briefly, the circumstances which gave rise to it. During the exercises that followed the dedication of a House of Worship, erected by the M. E. Church, the Rev. D. TENNEY, Universalist Minister, took exceptions to some of the terms used by me in a public discourse on that occasion, and addressed me a note, from which I give the following :

"Dear Sir: I attended your lecture of last evening, and observed that you made the following statement:— 'That we were exposed to endless death—the death that never dies;' and as you repeated it a number of times," &c. "Now, Dear Sir, permit me to enquire by what authority you made that declaration." \* \* \* "I am exceedingly skeptical concerning your opinions. Perhaps you can enlighten me on the subject."

After acknowledging the receipt of the above note, I replied: 'I have considered the matter, and will now say, that, at the earliest day practicable, I will take occasion to lecture on the points of doctrine, named in your note, before this community.—of the time and place you shall have due notice.' From his reply to this, we give the following:

"I propose that you procure some Minister, in good standing in your Church, to hold an oral discussion with a Minister of the Universalist Church, which I will procure of like standing, to discuss the fundamental principles that divide the denominations."

To this I acceded, and the Rev. N. DOOLITTLE was announced on the part of the Universalists; and the Rev. J. H. POWER, after being addressed by Mr. TENNEY, as well as myself, on the subject, accepted the invitation to meet him and discuss the questions as stated in connection with the rules that governed the debate.

The subject was fully and ably discussed, and a faithful report is herewith presented to the reading public.

PUBLISHER.

## QUESTIONS DISCUSSED.

Q. I. *Do the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament teach the doctrine of the ultimate holiness and happiness of the entire human race, in a state of immortality?* Mr. DOOLITTLE affirms, and Mr. POWER denies.

Q. II. *Do the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments teach the doctrine that any portion of the human race will suffer endless punishment in a state of immortality?* Mr. POWER affirms, and Mr. DOOLITTLE denies.

P. S. These questions fully open the whole subject of Universalism for full and free discussion.

## RULES.

I. Each disputant shall choose one chairman, who shall choose a third to set with them. They shall decide questions of order, keep the speakers to the point in debate, and preserve order in the congregation.

II. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be the standard of proof and appeal, and when proof is intended, chapter and verse shall be given.

III. The disputants shall speak alternately 30 minutes at a time, and longer with the consent of the other party. This will give the one holding the affirmative the opening and closing speech on his affirmative.

IV. The discussion shall commence July 29th, 1845, at 12 o'clock, M., and continue from day to day till the disputants agree to close it. Then they shall have one hour to sum up their arguments and make their closing speech, provided, they shall not introduce any new matter or arguments.

V. The above rules are mutually agreed to and signed by the disputants.

N. DOOLITTLE,  
J. H. POWER.

LAFORT, O., July 29th, 1845.

## MR. DOOLITTLE'S OPENING SPEECH.

TUESDAY, JULY 29, 1845, 1 o'clock, P. M.

QUESTION—*Do the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments teach the ultimate holiness and happiness of the entire human race in a state of immortality?*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS AND THE AUDIENCE:—

Before coming directly to the arguments on the question, I have some preliminary observations to make.

It is gratifying on this occasion, to see so large and respectable a company, convened for the purpose of listening to the discussion of some of the most important questions that can engage the attention of rational and moral beings. I feel to rejoice, that the present is an age of inquiry, far exceeding any other age that has gone before us. A spirit of investigation is abroad in the land, and all subjects are undergoing the closest scrutiny. Every theory in politics and religion, and every question in the sciences and arts, is undergoing the most thorough investigation—is being weighed in the balance to see if any thing be found wanting. This is a good omen. In the dark ages that have passed over the church, this spirit of inquiry and investigation was suppressed. It was considered dangerous for men to reason, to use the powers and faculties that made them moral beings. They were forbidden to follow that course, that would lead them to understand and receive truth, and reject error. Those days are gone by forever—brighter and better days have come. The present, we contemplate as an age of light. Knowledge is increasing, and will continue to advance, though earth and hell should conspire against it. The eternal years of God, are Truth's; and though crushed to the earth, she will rise again, and ascend aloft to her native skies, not a hair of her head will be injured. Let the seeds of truth be sown, and they will spring up and yield their



fruit. We need have no apprehensions, in regard to the ultimate progress and triumph of truth.

But the great question is, *What is Truth?*

There are many, even honest and good people, who have never formed any opinion on the great questions, which divide the Christian Church. They have come to the conclusion, that in the midst of this conflict of opinions, it is impossible to tell who is in the right. But, my friends, there is no difficulty in this matter. The path of truth is as the shining light, growing brighter and brighter the further we advance in it. And if we will divest ourselves of all prejudice and improper bias, and open our minds candidly to the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, there is no difficulty in arriving at a correct decision.—But in doing so, we must not only lay aside all those preconceived opinions and false notions we received from wrong early instruction, but we must reason on cause and effect, in religion as well as in science; for the same God that established the natural laws, also established the moral laws, by which mankind are governed. These laws are invariable in their operation and effect. There are certain principles laid down, by which we may try any doctrine of religion, and know whether it be true or false. What was the opinion of the great founder of Christianity? A tree is known by its fruits. What saith the Holy Spirit, by the beloved disciple? “Beloved believe not every spirit, (or doctrine,) but try the spirits, (or doctrines,) whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world.” Here you see it is taught or implied, that we may know whether a doctrine is true or not. As the Apostle Paul says, “*Prove all things.*” Do not take for granted, that *our creed* is right, but prove it; examine yourselves, to see whether ye be in the faith. This is the disposition or state of mind we are to be in—ready to examine candidly and with inquiring correctness, what is truth? And, my friends, I hope you have come here with such motives—that you have a single design—that you are disposed to know the truth—ready to listen to all the arguments on both sides, and to receive the light, and to abide by the law and testimony. For if we speak not ac-

According to the Word, believe us not; there is no truth in us. I want you to bear in mind, that there has been a great apostasy—that the church has travelled far out of the way, into many and dangerous superstitions. This began to prevail in the Apostles time. Hence he says, “In the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy,” &c. This has taken place. It prevailed through all the dark ages of the church. But in the age of the Reformation, light began to dawn; and from that time, the light has been going forth as the morning. A brighter day then began to dawn on us, and is now shedding its blaze over the church and the world. And it will continue to do so, until the principles of the Glorious Gospel of the Son of God, shall prevail over the whole earth. And we ought to rejoice, that we live in such a day; we ought to rejoice, that Luther and Melancthon, and the other reformers, were raised up and arrayed in the beautiful garments of Christianity, began such a great and glorious work. And yet, though they did much, a great work still remains to be done. Not all errors are exploded yet. Many yet remain. And among the most monstrous, and abominable, and terrible into which the church fell, as the effect of her apostasy, is the doctrine of *endless misery*, the endless perdition of a portion of the human family. But the truth is, this monstrous error is being exploded. Some of the best Christians, are now rejecting the doctrine of endless woe. And the number on every hand is hourly increasing. I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, yet I venture to predict, that in fifty years, this doctrine will not exist in the church. And if Christians will have a creed, the time will come when the doctrine of endless woe will be expunged from every creed in Christendom. The work is now going on, and will continue to go on, until this monstrous doctrine is blotted out of existence. And I regret, my friends, that I have been under the necessity of coming forty miles to meet a gentleman of Elder Power’s ability, learning, piety and good sense, to combat this doctrine in opposition to him. I sincerely regret, that in this age of the world, when there is so much light abroad in

the land, that a man can be found advocating this doctrine, with a zeal becoming a better cause. I regret that I have had to come here, to oppose a doctrine so abhorrent to common sense, to reason, and the Bible. 'This doctrine is at war with the best wishes, and most benevolent feelings of every christian, and of every friend of humanity.' Where will you find a Christian, whose heart is warm with love for his fellow man, that can pray in accordance with this doctrine?—that can pray for the endless misery of any part of the human family? No such one can be found. If he could, it would argue that he had been transformed into something else than human—into a demon, filled with the most malignant cruelty and hatred.

Now a doctrine that is at war with all the best feelings of the soul, did not, and could not come from God. It must be false. And I have all confidence, that before I shall leave this house, I shall make it appear, notwithstanding all the arguments the gentleman may bring up in opposition—and I believe he is able as any man that can be found. I give him full credit for all his ability, learning and zeal.

My friends, there is one thing yet to be proved from the Bible; and that is, the doctrine of endless punishment—the endless misery of moral beings, under the Government of God. This has never been proved, and never can be. Some of the greatest minds have come to see this, and have given up the idea of trying any more to do it. Many who have been arrayed under different banners of the church, members of different denominations, have become convinced that this is a great and dangerous error, and have rejected it; and are now devoting their energies to the advancement of a better doctrine.

I will observe that I have heard much of our friend's prowess and skill on these questions. It appears that his notoriety is very extensive, as a very able and skillful opposer of the doctrine we hold. I have heard much of the fame of our friend. I have heard things in his favor, and some things not in his favor. I hope that all I have heard in his favor will be realised at this time, and what I have heard of him that is not, we shall find to be false. It has

been reported to me, that it is hard keeping him to the point in debate. I hope the Moderators will have no difficulty on this matter.

Again : I have heard that he is disposed to take advantage of a challenge, to gain the sympathy of a congregation, by saying he has been challenged to discuss ; and I have heard that he intends to make capital out of this, at this time. But it is not the fact, that he has been challenged on this occasion. If I understand the matter, some third persons wanted to have a discussion at this time ; and on the part of the opposing side, the friends of Mr. POWER chose him, and on the part of our friends I have been chosen. I believe these are the facts in the premises. So I hope we shall have nothing said about a challenge. I hope it will be seen that we have not come here as Theological Gladiators, to see who can gain the victory, or to see who can make the most noise ; but, that we have come as sincere inquirers after truth, to get at the knowledge of the Scriptures, touching this great question—the *final destiny of man*. And I hope we shall deport ourselves as becomes men and christians, investigating such a momentous subject.

One remark in conclusion. I hope you will all resolve yourselves into a jury, and that you will listen to the discussion of these questions in candor—listen in the fear of God and in the love of man, disposed to give every argument its due weight, and make up your minds to give an impartial verdict at the close ; and on which side the balance of testimony may fall, you will receive it as truth.  
[Time expired.]

[MR. POWER'S OPENING SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and the Audience*—I rise to occupy a few minutes of time in some general remarks, before we pay particular attention to the question that is to be discussed before you on this occasion. And first : with regard to my position before this community. The gentleman has referred to this ; but I perceive he is laboring under some mistake. I stand before you on the invitation of my friend Mr. Doolittle, given by our mutual friend Esquire Tenney. In our correspondence, I stated

to him distinctly, that I never had challenged any person to discussion, and never should, unless I saw stronger reasons for it than I yet had; that I still occupied the same ground; that if the Universalists wished a discussion, and would invite me, I might accept the invitation. His reply was, that I was invited. So I stand before you, invited to discuss, and, if possible, to disprove the whole system of Universalism. And of course I should not be complained of, if I do this as thoroughly as I can. Respecting the gentleman's fears that I would make capital of the fact that I had been challenged, they are groundless, for I have no need of capital derived from any such source.

A second remark is: I agree with Mr. D. in respect to the importance of the question, and this has had much to do with my appearing before you at this time. The first order of talents and attainments have been called into requisition, to discuss the affairs of State, systems of finance, tariff, &c.—But surely all these are meager, compared with the question now before you for investigation—the *former* have their origin, and termination in this world—the *latter*, involves the highest interests of our entire race, both in this and the eternal world.

A third remark of a general character: Persons occupying the position that I do, have been subjected to severe animadversions, for a fearless exposure of the system I here oppose. And I can scarcely entertain a hope, that I will fare better than others on this subject.

We now call your attention to some facts bearing on the question. The system we oppose, does not take its stand with others, on Biblical testimony. All other Christian systems, though they may differ on some minor points, agree on the fundamental principles of the Bible. But this is not the case with this system; on the contrary, it differs from all Christian denominations, on all the cardinal points of religion. We need only to look into Universalist's publications, and listen to the lectures of their preachers, to be convinced of the fact, that the system places its broad seal of universal and unconditional condemnation on all other systems of religion under heaven; and claims alone to contain the truth, in opposition to all

others. And hence it is inherently and immutably opposed to all other systems of Bible Christianity.

The gentleman has already announced that the church, of course including all other Christian denominations, hold this "most monstrous, and abominable, and terrible doctrine (the effect of her apostasy) of endless misery." Mr. friend, Mr. D., presents himself here to oppose the church, that is, all Christian denominations on this point. It is in this light we will view it, and in this character meet it. And we expect to be able to show that the system is not only opposed to the Church, to Bible Christianity on this point, but every other cardinal doctrine of religion contained in the Scriptures. We wish these points to be kept distinctly in view by the community.

As the gentleman has adduced no proof, or argument, and has made no point which requires a reply, I need make but a few remarks more:

Mr. D. has very kindly alluded to my reputation; and has attributed to me a character that I have never claimed, namely: "an able and masterly disputant." And I was not aware that my friends claimed any such character for me. In regard to the bad qualities ascribed to me, I shall make no disclaimer. I do not claim to have no defects; and will only say, this audience will be my witness in this matter. If they find that I do not keep to the question in debate, they will have reason to suppose that these reports about me, as alluded to by the gentleman, are true.

In conclusion. Gentlemen Moderators—Although I will not say of Mr. D., that I have heard that he is apt to wander from the point, yet his course, in his eloquent speech, suggested to me, and perhaps others had the same view, that he does not keep very close to the point. For his question is, "Do the Scriptures teach," &c.; yet he never touched this point, but came over on to my question, and told us what he intended to do hereafter.

Well, I never went to war without expecting to be scared, and I will wait till the gentleman commences regularly the discussion of his question, before I indulge any fears.

Before I take my seat, I will say to Mr. D., that we have a right to expect of him a clear and lucid definition of the

points he intends to prove in his affirmation, and that he will not deal in generals; that he will prove his positions from the Sacred Records, that we may have a fair opportunity to join issue on this question. And we have the more reason to expect this of him, as he has already called up the subject of keeping to the question, and being definite in our positions.

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S SECOND SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators*—Before coming directly to the argument, I will notice one or two statements of Elder Power. First, he states, that he stands here merely on invitation. If he will be informed, I think he will see his mistake. I knew nothing of the discussion till I was informed by my friend here, Mr. Tenny. He informed me, that he, on the part of the Universalists, and a brother of Elder Power, on the part of the Methodists, had entered into an agreement to have a discussion. He stated that the Methodists had chosen Elder Power, and, that he chose me, and informed me of it. This was the first I heard of it. So, I had no part in settling the matter—in proposing and agreeing on the discussion. It is not by any invitation from me, that Elder Power is here.

He says, that the system of faith and doctrine, that I have the honor of defending, is a system of faith that stands opposed to all the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, and is opposed to all other systems. But, you, who are intelligent and informed on this subject, know this is not the fact. We do claim to have the best faith and the best hope of any department of the Christian Church. And why? Not because we suppose our system is opposed to all others, but, because it embraces all the good embraced in all other systems, all the truth and righteousness, and goes farther—it embraces the glorious doctrine of the final Restitution of all things—the ultimate holiness and happiness of every individual of the human family. And this is the cardinal point on which we differ. We agree on all the practical points held by others; but, we go farther. Our system is more extensive. It stands on the

broad platform of universal benevolence and Christian philanthropy.

To show, farther, the error of my friend, I suppose that the foundation of all true Christianity is the belief in the existence of one God, and in Jesus Christ, as the Saviour of all mankind.—Now, we believe in God, the Creator and moral Governor of the Universe; and, we believe in Jesus Christ, who will purify all and raise them to a state of immortality. And, if the gentleman had been informed in regard to the Articles of Faith of the great founders of Christianity, he would not have made such erroneous statements. They required men to believe in God and in Jesus Christ, as the true Messiah, and this was all. Says the Saviour: "Ye believe in God, believe also in me" These are the cardinal points of true Christianity, and these we hold. So, I hope the gentleman will not accuse us again, of rejecting all the great cardinal points.

I now come directly to the question: "Do the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments teach the ultimate holiness and happiness of the whole human family, in a state of immortality?" I affirm they do. And the first position I take is, that through the mighty power and redeeming grace of God, the whole creation, every human being, will be raised into a state of immortality, of incorruption, and glory, and purity—to the enjoyment of an endless life of holiness and happiness; that God has revealed and taught this in the Scriptures; that He designs to raise the whole human family from a state of mortality to immortality, from corruption to incorruption, from universal impurity to a state of universal, immortal purity, holiness and happiness; that God has purposed this, as the result of His government; that there is no power to disannul it.

Now, for proof, we will turn to 1 Cor., chap. xv., where Paul labors to establish and demonstrate the glorious doctrine of the resurrection of all men, to an immortal state of incorruption and glory. The first part of the chapter is devoted to the establishment of the fact. In the second place he demonstrates the universality of this change. Hence says the Apostle, (commencing at verse 20,) "But now is Christ risen from the dead and become



the first fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." I will here explain the meaning of the term Adam. It does not mean as the old Catechism says: "In Adam's fall we sinned all." It does not mean that a certain individual, the parent of our race, sinned and involved the whole world in guilt; but the term means the earthly constitution of man, or the earthy man. We have all been clothed with this nature, in this earthy constitution we have all sinned, as Adam the first man sinned. And in this nature we all die, "as in Adam all die." Now the question is, how do we die in this Adamic nature? This is important, because, from the death we experience, in the earthy constitution, we are to be made alive, in the heavenly constitution. This death is of a two-fold nature. First, we all die a natural, temporal death, as physical beings, by a law of our organic nature. Second, we all die a moral or spiritual death. And hence it is said, "to be carnally minded is death." "The wages of sin is death," "Death passed upon all men for that all have sinned," as Adam sinned. Here, then, we see, there is a death of a two-fold nature, which we die in Adam. First, a physical death. We are created mortal beings. Adam was informed how he was created, viz., of the dust of the earth, "For dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return." We likewise die a moral or spiritual death; because, we all have sinned. Mark, all men experience this two-fold death. Inasmuch as we are organized beings, we must die a natural death. And, as all have sinned, moral or spiritual death has passed upon all men. "As in Adam all die," without exception, *even so* all are made alive in Christ. They are made alive in Christ, and they are redeemed from this two-fold death and made immortal, made wholly incorrupt and happy. For proof of this, read farther. "Then cometh the end when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and authority all and power." "For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." This means the destruction of all enemies. "The last enemy

that shall be destroyed is death " What is this last enemy? There is no one beyond the last, remember. And this last enemy is death. Why is it that such a glorious and happy result and termination shall attend this event of making all the vast humanity alive in Christ? Why, my friends, it is the destruction of the last evil—the last foe to God and man. Hence says the Apostle, "it is sown in corruption it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power." There is no corruption in the resurrection state. "The first man is of the earth, earthy." And we have all borne the image of the earthy. The second man is the Lord from heaven. So we must bear the image of the heavenly. "And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

Why must we bear the image of the heavenly? Paul gives the reason: "Now this I say brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." But he adds: "Behold I shew you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, we shall all be changed." Mark, *all* shall be changed; and this is a perfect change—"In a moment, in a twinkling of an eye at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised." But how raised? Our friend, Power, will tell you they will be raised physically right, but sin and moral corruption will be inherited by a large portion of the human family who will be raised in the resurrection. But not so, saith the Apostle. He says, "all shall be changed." And this shall be a glorious change; "for the dead shall be raised *incorruptible*." "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, will there be endless wailing, and woe, and damnation? No; Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written: "Death is swallowed up in victory, O! Death! where is thy sting, O! Grave! where is thy victory." That this change is from both moral and physical corruption—that it makes all on whom its power

passes pure and holy, is plain from what follows: "The sting of death is sin and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." How do we have the victory? "As in Adam all die even so in Christ shall all be made alive. When this takes place, then shall come to pass the saying that is written: "O Death! where is thy sting, O Grave! where is thy victory?" This saying is found in the prophesy of Isa. xxv. 7, 8, "And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people and the vail that is spread over all Nations. He will swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces, and the rebuke of his people shall be taken away from off all the Earth, for the Lord hath spoken it." Does this passage teach a partial salvation—the endless misery of part of mankind? No; It contains as glorious a promise as can be found in the Bible, "God will wipe away tears from off *all* faces." Paul quotes this passage, and applies it to the Resurrection state. In the Resurrection this prophesy will be fulfilled, and not before; then the vail that is spread over all nations will be taken off; then all will shout victory; then shall we triumph over death, sin, and corruption, over every foe—a glorious immortal triumph! All men then will be redeemed, sanctified, and purified. The great author of our salvation will tell you, that those who attain this state, will be equal to the Angels: Luke xx. 35, 36, "But they which shall be counted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can they die any more, for they are equal with the Angels, and are the children of God: being the children of the resurrection." This will be a glorious change. Paul speaks of it again, in Romans viii. 20, 21, "For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope. But the creature itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." The Apostle is here referring to this very resurrection. The creature shall be delivered. How delivered? Not from physical corruption merely, but

from the corruption of sin, into the glorious liberty of the children of God. "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now," not a part of the creation, mark! but the whole. "And not only they, but we ourselves also which have the first fruits of the spirit"—referring to an ancient custom of the Jews in bringing the first fruits as an offering, and in this they received a pledge that all their harvests should be gathered in and safely stored in the garner. This is the strongest language the Apostle could use in proof that the whole creation shall be gathered into the kingdom of God. This my friends is the conclusion of the whole matter. Here is a chain that cannot be broken. My friend here, (who I understand has been a forger of iron,) knows what a strong chain is. Here is a whole chain without a swivel on which he may exert all his power—not a link will he be able to break.

[Time expired.]

[MR. POWER'S SECOND REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Modérators*—I shall wave any remarks the gentleman has made relative to our position here in regard to the challenge, only remarking that I have the documents to prove that what I have stated is correct.

I will now make a few observations:

1st. On the gentleman's disclaimer that the system he maintains is not opposed, cardinally, fundamentally opposed to all others. In proof of his orthodoxy, he quoted "ye believe in God, believe also in me," and stated that he believed in God and in Christ his redemption, and salvation through his redemption; that he agreed with all other denominations in this. But mark this difference. The gentleman's system maintains that we may disbelieve in God—in Jesus Christ—his redemption—the Bible and every truth revealed to man, and yet be as sure of salvation and heaven as if we should believe and practice all these truths. Here his system and ours are fundamentally and diametrically opposed.

Again—under the same head is a link of the gentleman's supposed strong chain, and that two without a swivel. In proof of his theory, he quoted "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," This he has undertaken to explain. He told us that Adam did not mean a solitary man—an individual that had sinned, and that in consequence of that sin, death entered into the world: but means the physical constitution of every man. And here you see that the system he maintains is at direct and immutable issue with all other systems in christendom.

The gentleman referred to my art as a blacksmith. Gentlemen Moderators, I never was ashamed of my profession. A greater personage than myself was a mechanic. However, to try his chain we will place his argument on the anvil and see if it will stand the hammer.

The gentleman is so far committed to his system, that he cannot get away from the position that Christ and Adam stand on the same ground. He has given us a definition of Adam—a constitution of no particular man, but a certain earthy nature belonging to every man. Then of course, Christ is not a particular man, a single individual, but a constitution—something that the Bible knows nothing of, an indefinable unknown something, which man never saw and never can see. So you see this system is directly opposed to all systems of christianity in the world. It utterly rejects Jesus Christ as a real person or being. So he must give up this point that his system is not opposed to all others.

You see that if his chain has not a swivel, it has at least a crooked link which cannot bear the hammer of truth.

Mr. D. in undertaking to dispose of some difficulties in his way, has fallen into others far greater. Should we concede every thing that he has maintained in regard to the resurrection of the body, it leaves the main point, namely the salvation of the soul untouched. We admit that there is to be a change of the body—a resurrection of all mankind. But that does not touch the question of the soul at all. The Apostle is speaking in the 15th chapter of 1st Cor. of the resurrection of the body. The question of the soul's salvation is referred for decision to other

portions of the sacred scriptures. Then to allow all Mr. D. has contended for in his exposition of this chapter, he has only got to the resurrection of the body, and the soul is left unprovided for.

A remark in reference to his last quotation from the 8th of Romans. This text must be understood literally, without any qualification, or it must be restricted. If the former, then the earth, the beasts, and every living thing, will have to be taken to heaven: but if in the latter, all its supposed support of the system vanishes.

What is meant by the liberty of the sons of God? In John I. 11, 12, we read in reference to the Savior, "He came to his own and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on his name." Those only are the children of God that believe in Christ, and receive him as their Savior. Here in Romans, the Apostle pens a prediction of what shall take place. The whole world shall have the offer of salvation through Jesus Christ; and those who accept the offer shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption. These are the only remarks I will make at present on Mr. D's proof, and proceed to occupy your time a few minutes, with another view of the subject.

The discussion if I have correct views of it, is designed to be of practical use to the people in attendance, and we hope it is the desire of all that it shall be made scripturally and spiritually profitable.

We will now notice 1st. the points on which we appear to agree, for the agreement is but in appearance, and not in fact; and 2d. the main points on which we disagree.

The issue is not whether God has made provision for the resurrection of the body. Nor whether the gospel is to be preached to the whole world. Nor whether God has made provision for the salvation of the whole human family. These are points in which, in appearance at least, we agree. We rejoice to maintain that God has made the fullest provision for the salvation of every member of the human family. But the practical question is, *does not God require something of man, in order to avail himself of*

*this salvation?* Here we are at direct issue. The system we oppose, releases man from all obligation whatever, from the performance of every duty as a condition, or means of salvation in heaven. While we maintain the contrary; that God has fixed certain conditions on which man may obtain eternal life. Mark, here is the point on which we join issue. And I will here remind you to observe and see if we keep to the point, and if we do not then pass your verdict of condemnation.

Mr. D's proof, thus far, falls infinitely short of reaching the point which he wants to maintain. To touch the point he must show from the scriptures that God releases every member of our race, with reference to our final salvation, from every shadow of responsibility. If this is not his position, if he says God does hold man morally responsible, as a condition of his salvation, then he must show from the Bible, that every man has or does, faithfully discharge this responsibility. But this he cannot do. This position is wholly destitute of evidence from the Bible, and the world is too full of evidence to the contrary.

But another feature of difference between us, and in which the system we oppose, is diametrically at war with, and opposed to all true systems of christianity, is, that man may employ all the power he possesses both physical and moral, in rebellion against God, in disbelief of his word, in blasphemy against his maker, or in any other way, and that it will not make the least difference about his salvation. Now Mr. D. has to prove all this, and to prove too, from the holy scriptures, that it is out of man's power to do any thing whatever to keep himself out of heaven—that no individual can by living in the greatest possible wickedness and blasphemy, and dying in this state, do any thing to hinder his entering the kingdom of glory as soon as he leaves this world.

Every individual, who has ever reflected a moment, with reference to the future state, could but ask the question—does God require any thing of me in regard to my future state of existence! or has He released me from all responsibility respecting it?

Gentlemen—I have a right to expect that my friend *here will take up these points, and sustain the positions of*

his system from the Bible. God has revealed to us that we are to exist in the future, and we are desirous to know, what shall be our state there, and whether we can do any thing in this life to affect our state of existence in the future. And as the system Mr. D. maintains, claims alone to be true, we demand of it to tell us plainly and clearly, whether we have any duty to perform to secure eternal salvation.

We will now in a few remarks call up the attention of the gentleman again to the points we have made; for he has informed us that he is in favor of keeping to the point, and I wish to present them particularly to his view. We have disposed of his scripture testimony. We have shown the difficulty into which he has gotten by his explanation of the term Adam: that according to it, Christ is not a real person or being, but only a constitutional nature belonging to man. Again, his dilemma in his exposition of the passage in the 8th of Romans—if he considers it figuratively, it affords no proof whatever—if literally, he must take all things both animate and inanimate to heaven. We have noticed some points in which we appear to agree, and some in regard to which we disagree. We stated the question, has God released man from every shadow of responsibility in this life, in reference to a future state of existence. If the gentleman takes the ground that man is released from all responsibility, then he is at direct issue with the scriptures. If he takes the ground that he is not, then he must show that every man has fully met all these responsibilities, or he perfectly fails to sustain his system, [*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S THIRD SPEECH.]

My friends I should be very sorry to have any of you get alarmed, especially at the outset, in reference to the heretical sentiments which we hold. I observe that my friend here has been trying to make you believe that we are very wide from the mark, awfully in the dark, and at a great distance from the cardinal points, that we are the greatest of heretics, if not the chief of sinners. And I did suppose that he could forge out some better argu-



ments, (for I would remark that I alluded to his occupation not with any disparagement, for I hold it to be rather an honor than a dishonor to him.) Some of the most able advocates of our belief have been mechanics. But I did suppose that he could forge out something better than such severe and false charges against our system.

He has been wandering far from the question, and has been talking about the moral accountability and free agency of man in this life. Now this has nothing to do with the question. The question is, "Do the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, teach the ultimate holiness and happiness of every individual of the human race in a state of immortality?" This is a question of Theology, not of the practical duties of men in this life. I came here to discuss this question. You can see what our friend has said about man's responsibility, &c. is entirely foreign from the question; it has nothing to do with the points at issue. As it respects man's moral accountability, he charges me with denying it. But I do not. I hold that man is responsible, as a neighbor, as a Christian and as a citizen—responsible in many ways, and if he violates these responsibilities, he is held accountable; and punished accordingly. I believe this, as fully as my friend does. And why he should charge me with not believing it, I know not, unless it was to prejudice your minds, and make my system look awful, and thus excite your fears. But, my friends, do not be frightened. I want you to keep cool. There is no bear in the way—no lion—no devouring tiger, that will rend you to pieces. When you see any beast with horns or claws, you may begin to be frightened; but until then, you need not be alarmed.

And now, although it is all together gratuitous, and not to the point, I will notice the charges he brought against me, of holding such heretical sentiments, viz: that man's immortal destiny, his eternal salvation and redemption in a state of immortality, do not depend on his acts or faith in this life. I do hold these sentiments, and God holds them too, and has proclaimed them—the Apostle has proclaimed them—the great Author of Christianity has proclaimed them—the Apostle has taught that salvation is

not of works, lest any man should boast, but the gift of God is Eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. Does my friend mean, when he charges me with holding, that "God releases man from all responsibility in this life," that this is in direct opposition to what he holds? Does he hold, that man's salvation is dependent on his works? No. As a Preacher of the Gospel, he will tell you, (and so will every preacher of his denomination,) that the salvation of man is the gift of God—that it is not a salvation of good works. He will not base it on the score of merit any more than I do. Why then charge me with holding something so heretical—something that would deluge the whole church and world with wickedness? That man can merit by his good works immortal life, I do not hold—neither does the Bible teach it; Salvation is the gift of God.

Now with respect to this Adam, our friend is trying to make you believe we are in error on this point. What ground did I take on this. Why as Paul says, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." This was proved to a demonstration by testimony from Holy Writ—that the whole human race should be redeemed and delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God—that this was not to be a partial deliverance—that we should be clothed upon with immortality, and still possess the character of devils? This change was to be an entire change, from corruption to incorruption, from sin to holiness. This was my position—this was the strong chain I called him to take hold of, to see if he could break it. But after trying it upon his anvil, he comes to the conclusion that one link is crooked, but not broken, and that one stroke of his hammer would break it.

But still he did not break it, and I challenge him to do it. But he was mistaken about there being one crooked link. There is not *one*; the chain is whole; it cannot be broken. It is the purpose of God, in which he was governed by his immutable justice, his eternal love and benevolence, that man, created in His own image, though fallen and depraved, should ultimately be redeemed into a state of glorious immortality, incorruption and holiness. And what has the Gentleman, here, done with this chain

of argument; has he broken a link? No! He has not even touched it. We now ask him to come right up to this point and take hold of it. Do the Scriptures teach the entire holiness and happiness of the whole human race? He will find enough to do here, on this point, without taking any wider range; for, right in the outset of this discussion, I deem I have set forth an argument that cannot be overthrown. It will haunt the Gentlemen till doom's day, like a ghost. He cannot get over it nor around it. It will rise up before him, like a mountain. It is nothing short of the eternal purpose of God—what He had determined to do for the human race,—that He will place man beyond the reach of sin—beyond the reach of every evil and every foe, and raise him to a state of holiness and happiness in heaven. And He holds man as with a golden chain, the indissoluble chain of love. He will prepare him for an inheritance incorruptible and full of Glory.

Now what more shall we do to strengthen this argument. I have given the gentleman all he wanted, and more than he claims, and yet the chain is too strong to be broke. The strongest giants in theology have grappled with this argument, but they have found it like the pillars of heaven—it cannot be shaken.

Again: he charges me with being heretical. If I am, it is not the want of early Orthodox instruction. In my young days, I had to commit to memory the Catechism. Every Saturday, I must have my lesson; I there learned this, "In Adam's fall we sinned all." I know that one hinge of the gentleman's creed is the doctrine contained in this passage—total depravity. This doctrine I confess I do not hold. I do not understand it to be taught in the Bible. Paul says, "By one man sin entered into the world." Adam we admit was the first sinner, but that all men became totally depraved by his sin, does not follow. "So death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." We see, then, that death passed upon all, or all are depraved, not because Adam sinned, but because all have sinned. By Adam I said, I understood the Adamic nature, the earthy constitution. This is what the term Adam means in the original Hebrew, Earthy, Red, human, the earthy

man. In Adam, the earthy man, we all die both a moral and physical death, but in Christ, the spiritual man, we are to be made alive. We have all sinned as Adam sinned, because we have the same nature that Adam had. We die just as Adam died. "We all have sinned, and come short of the Glory of God." And we all are to be made alive in Christ; and when made alive in Christ, we shall be incorruptible, immortal, holy and happy.

My friend tries to do away with the force of the passage from the 8th of Rom. He tries to make out that it proves too much. But the question is, does it prove what I want it to prove. If it does, that is all I want, and if he makes it prove more, I have no objection. The Apostle says, "The creature itself shall be delivered." The best critics will tell you Creature is the same as Creation. And the creature is made subject to vanity. God made man as he saw fit to make him, subject to sin and death; but he has prepared a deliverance for him, from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. But my friend says, this proves too much—that if understood in a literal sense, it will include all the beasts of the field, the whole animate creation. Well, if it proves this, I have no objection. The Rev. John Wesley preached this doctrine. He contended that the whole animal creation, literally, should be clothed with immortality, and compensated for all they had suffered here—that literally the beasts of the field should lie down in green pastures and beside the still waters. Now if my friend wishes to understand this as Mr. Wesley did, I have no objection. But whether it does or does not have this extensive signification, it means at least the whole intelligent creation—that all moral agents shall have a glorious redemption—that all created intelligencies in this lower world, that have been subject to sin and vanity, misery and death, shall be delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God. If it means any more, I have no objection: I am certain it means all this.

I hope our friend will come up now and take hold of this argument again—I pledge myself that I shall not lose sight of it. It becomes him to use his time to the best

advantage, and not spend it in wandering from the point.

Again, I quote, respecting the will of God in regard to this resurrection, for it is the will of God, that man should be thus raised, I. Tim. ii., 3, 4; "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour," (what is good and acceptable? what follows?) "who will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth." He will not only have them to be saved, but, come to the knowledge of the truth, which is essential to this salvation. This is proclaimed as the will of God. Now, are we certified, on the part of God, that he will accomplish this work? We are! Dan. iv, 35—"And all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, what doest thou?" Here God tells us, he doeth according to his will, and his will is, that all men should be saved. For further evidence of God's will towards us, see Eph. i. 8, 9, 10: "Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence, having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him." [*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S THIRD REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators*—I am inclined to think, that the gentleman intended something in stating, when on the floor the first time, that it was difficult to keep me to the question. With less acquaintance with the system than I have, I might be a little surprised. But a full acquaintance with it, has fully prepared me for this. And I will state that I placed this postscript at the bottom of these questions for just such an exigency as this. For I knew it was the custom of Universalists in these discussions, to make, as lawyers say, a false issue. I wrote this postscript that there might not be the opportunity of doing this at this time, and I will refer him to that note, in order to save

him from any further reference about my not keeping to the point. I will read it: "These questions fully open the whole subject of Universalism for full and free discussion." [Here Mr. Doolittle arose, and stated that he had not thus understood it—that it gave liberty to discuss any thing and every thing, just as the speaker chose.] After which, Mr. Power again arose and said: Gentlemen Moderators—I rather regret to see the gentleman manifesting so much uneasiness, just as we have approached the main body of the discussion. And I will just remark, that I placed this postscript in as plain, unambiguous language as I could think of; meaning just what it says. Now, surely, it must be a singular genius that can suspect any thing from such language as this. I understand, gentlemen, that the question before us, opens the vital and fundamental ground of the subject which comes before us. I understand that it gives the gentleman the same privilege that I have; to take the strong features on my affirmative, and make them false if possible. This was the position I took, And I assure you I did not leave my family sick, and come a hundred miles, merely to leave my antagonist to take the ground just as he pleased, and confine me to it; but to go into the main question, and discuss the general principles of Universalism. And before we leave, the gentleman will have full opportunity to discuss the entire ground of my system. I hope my friend will not be troubled so soon, for I give him notice, that this is but the beginning of sorrows for his system. For I intend to take the whole ground, and show that the positions that he has taken, are all fundamentally false.

Now to the point. Mr. D., when last up, quoted from Daniel, to prove the sovereignty of Jehovah. On this point we have no issue. That God is an infinite being, and acts according to his own will and purpose, I most fully believe. But that it is the will of God to release man in this state of being, from every shadow of responsibility in reference to his future existence, and bring him by an act of Divine Sovereignty into a state of holiness and happiness—this we deny. The gentleman has quoted from 11 chap. of Paul's first letter to Timothy. Before I make

any remarks on this, I wish to notice two positions. I stated that we agree, at least in form, that God has made provision for the salvation of the whole human family in the future world. This then is not the point at issue. Again, we maintain that man has certain duties to perform, as conditions of future happiness. While Mr. D. maintains God releases man from all conditions, *ergo*, we hold that God requires faith of every adult person, as a condition of eternal life; while the gentleman's system maintains that God does not require faith as a condition of this. Again, we maintain that so far from God's releasing man, he requires him to reform; and if he does not reform, and thus avail himself of the grace of God, he will be eternally lost. The system I oppose, maintains that God requires no reformation in man, as a condition of his salvation—that God does not require man to love his Maker in this world, to be a subject of eternal salvation hereafter. It maintains that God saves men, though they live and die in entire unbelief, without piety, in cherished, settled hostility to God. We say, his system maintains all this—that it is the stern will and purpose of God to save all, notwithstanding all the crimes they may commit in this world from birth till death. Now you will recollect that he has the affirmative, and it is for him to prove this; and it is for you to judge whether he does bring this proof.

The gentleman remarked, that if men sinned, God would punish them. But his system maintains that all this punishment takes place in this world. Now these are the positions we deny, and we challenge (using the term respectfully) the gentleman to bring proof from the Word of God, where He releases man from all obligation—to bring a passage that has any shadow of proof, where God releases man from all obligation to reform—to bring proof, where God releases man from obligations of loving his Maker, with reference to his final salvation in a future world. And we are aware that we invite him to a great task, for the proof is not to be found in the Bible.

I will now refer a moment, to Mr. D.'s quotation from 1 Tim., "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior; Who will have all men to be saved and come

unto the knowledge of the truth." Now, if he maintains that this has reference to eternal salvation, as he has done, he must admit that God requires the fulfilling of duties; that supplications, prayers, &c., (as in the first verse,) be made, as a condition of eternal salvation. Then he has either to abandon his ground, that all men will be unconditionally saved, or prove that all men do, always have done, and always will, as a matter of fact, fulfil all these conditions.

Again: the sovereign will of God is brought in support of his theory. But to avail the system anything, this will of God must be unconditional. If God will, *unconditionally*, have all men come to the knowledge of the truth, and be saved, then, of course, the system will stand. But, I ask, if it is the will of God that all men should unconditionally come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved, in this world. If it is, then His will is not done; for we have too appalling evidence all around us, that all men do not come to the knowledge of the truth in this life. Then here is the gentleman's dilemma—either God does not will that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth in this life and be saved, or his will is not done. He may take just which horn he pleases. If he says it is not God's will that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth in this life and be saved, then all men have perfect license, so far as the pleasure of God is concerned, to go on in all the sin and crime they please. But is this in accordance with the character of Deity? The idea is shocking and blasphemous! Then it is plain, that God's will in the salvation of man is not *unconditional*, and this scripture avails the gentleman's system not the least.

A word now in regard to the quotation from Rom. viii. Mr. D., has conceded that the scripture here referred to, has to be understood in a restricted sense—meaning *all intelligent beings*. We have nothing to do with Mr. Wesley's notions about the resurrection of beasts. We have only to refer you to what we said before—that in this text there is not one word about the salvation of the whole human race. Those spoken of, were to be brought into the liberty of the children of God. But who become the children of



God? John says, John i, 12: "But as many as received him to them, [and them only,] gave he power to become the sons or children of God, even to them that believe on his name." Here then, is a condition of becoming the children of God, and we know this condition is not fulfilled by all men. This text, then, affords no proof of universal salvation.

Again: We will turn to the 15th of 1st Cor. I know Mr. D. plants himself here, as firmly as he can; for this is his strongest position, on which he mostly relies. You recollect we said this refers only to the resurrection of the body, and has not a word of reference in regard to the future condition of the soul. And we repeat, that if we should concede all he would ask in regard to the resurrection of the body, it would not reach the state of the soul.

Again: He has not met the difficulty that by making Adam an ideal being, as Christ and Adam were contrasted, he makes Christ also an ideal being. He tells us that Adam means the earthy constitution of man. Well, then Christ must mean, not the Christ of the Bible, not the literal Christ that bore our sins on the tree: not the Christ that was crucified for our redemption, rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, to prepare a place for us—but an ideal—a constitutional Christ—a kind of spiritual nature that belongs to every man. Is not this a virtual rejection of Christ? Mr. D. touched this point, saw the difficulty and left it. The manner in which he passed over it, shows that he feels this to be a real difficulty. But to show that his position contradicts the facts of the Bible, I refer to Romans v. 18. "Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life." Here surely it is plain that persons are referred to in their representative character, and not as mere ideal constitutional natures of every man.

A word in reference to the argument on the resurrection. To show that the resurrection of the body does not affect the condition of the soul, I will give authority that cannot be questioned, John v. 28, 29, "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they

that have done good to the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Jesus Christ here teaches the doctrine of a spiritual resurrection, and in addition the resurrection of the body. That he has reference to the resurrection of the body there can be no doubt, "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice." This must refer to the body. Here then is a resurrection of the body which does not affect the character or condition of the soul; for some are raised to life, and some to damnation. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S FOURTH SPEECH.]

"The first thing I shall notice my friends is the proof used by my friend Power, to sustain the saying, "In Adam's fall we sinned all." The doctrine is that by Adam's sin all mankind are totally depraved—incapable of thinking a good thought, speaking a good word, or doing a good deed,—that each individual is a mere lump of moral dross.

Now, perhaps the gentleman's marvelousness is large enough to believe such a doctrine as this—but I cannot believe it, and I am not alone in this, some even who were once firm believers of this doctrine, have rejected it; some of the old school have lately come out against it. Professor Stewart no longer holds this doctrine. The mind, he says, in coming into this world, is like a sheet of white paper, capable of receiving good or bad impressions.

Says the Savior, "except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven!" Does this look like the doctrine of total depravity? "Like little children"—implying that all come into this world free from depravity and sin, already fit for the kingdom of heaven.

The Apostle Paul never taught the doctrine that we all sinned in Adam. He did teach that the first man in the garden of Eden sinned. He teaches too that death is the effect of transgression, of sin, and that death passed upon all men. But why passed upon all men? Because all have sinned, not because Adam sinned. So we cannot lay all the consequences of sin upon Adam, or upon the devil,

but all suffer the consequences, because all sin. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." "The father shall not be punished for the iniquities of the son, nor the son for the transgressions of the father.

Again: my friend says that the resurrection in raising the body to a state of immortality and glory does not effect the condition of the soul i. e. if the man dies a drunkard, he will remain a drunkard to all eternity, if he dies a gambler, he will remain a gambler to all eternity—if a fiddler, he will eternally remain a fiddler—so that every propensity he may indulge in this life, and die with it, he will have the same propensity throughout eternity—that when the body is raised incorruptible, the disposition of the mind remains the same. But in this he comes in contact with Paul, not with me only. Paul will have this change effect the soul as well as the body, affect the whole man, all the rational and physical being. "It is sown" says he a "natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." In the whole description here, he contrasts the present condition of man in a state of corruption, with his future condition in incorruption and glory. And now if this change is not to effect the soul, why does he not tell us. "We shall all be changed." Physical nor moral corruption, cannot inherit heaven. How shall we be changed? So changed that then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written. "Death is swallowed up in victory. O! death, where is thy sting! O! grave where is thy victory." To show us more clearly, that this is a moral as well as a physical change, he says "The sting of death is sin," and he has told us "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. All this to take place in the resurrection, and yet the gentleman has the presumption, in the face of all that Paul says here, to come forward and tell us this change is a mere physical change, and does not alter the moral condition of the soul.

Again; I notice another statement very wide from the truth—that the system of Universalism requires no change whatever in man, that he may enter heaven. This is the substance of the statement, and it is calculated to prejudice the hearers—now it is a new and strange idea that we hold that a man can be holy and happy in his sins. We

believe holiness is essential to happiness, as much as the gentleman does. Here then we do not differ.

But he believes that man's immortal existence in a state of holiness and happiness, is predicated on this contingency,—faith and good works in this world. Well if he believes this, he denies his creed and contradicts himself. But he says he charges upon me the belief that man's future destiny does not depend upon faith and good works in this life. Well this is Bible doctrine, and we could show it, but it would be wandering from the point—this is not the question in debate. I say the Bible doctrine is, that eternal salvation is no where predicated on man's faith and works in this life; it does not rest on such a contingency. It rests on God's unbounded grace and mercy. But it is not a fact that we make no change necessary. There is a change made in the resurrection, a change which redeems this sinful polluted earthly being and makes him equal to the angels. Now, this is the gift of God and we will give scripture proof of it—for we have been challenged to give it. This, however, I repeat is not the question. Our condition in the future world has nothing to do with the way of getting there.

You remember perhaps what the old Dutchman said, when he carried his wheat to Albany—that they never asked what road he came, but whether his wheat was good. So will it be in heaven, we never shall be asked what way we came, or how the change in us was effected, but are you holy? Have you the moral image of Christ and God. If you possess this character enter into your inheritance—incorruptible and that, fadeth not away. Now, this change is dependent alone on the purpose of God. It is God's purpose that all should be raised up to an immortal and glorious inheritance. This does not depend on man but on God. And my friends we can do just as much towards solving the question, how we shall be changed, as we can towards solving what shall be our condition in the resurrection. When a man dies it is for God to say whether he shall live again—he can do nothing to effect his own resurrection.

This depends on the will of Jehova alone, and the mode

and condition of his existence depends on God alone—not on faith at all. And yet faith and good works are important to man's peace and happiness in this world. I attach much importance to these and so does the Bible. But as regards eternal life. What were our Savior's views on this subject? Who will claim to be purer or more worthy than his disciples,—and does Christ promise them immortal life, for their good works here? When ye have done all, says He, "say ye are unprofitable servants." Could the disciples claim any thing on the score of good works. My friends as it respects good works from the best of us, let us do all we can, when we die we shall find that we are under everlasting obligation of gratitude to God for past mercies and blessings,—we shall have nothing to constitute a claim to eternal life.

Now to establish my position, that salvation does not depend on faith and good works, I adduce the proof, 2. Timothy i. 9, 10, "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works [mark] but according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." You see here no chance of boasting on account of works. If further proof is wanted, we will give it, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. Rom. vi. 23, "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." For further confirmation, Rom. v. 15, "But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many." What language can be plainer, that salvation is the gift of God alone? This free gift is also a universal gift, to be enjoyed by every son and daughter of Adam. It comes on all men. What more can we ask than this. I ask nothing more to settle my holiness and happiness eternally. And what do we find here to merit or claim this free gift. "Where sin aboun-

ed, grace did much more abound." As extensive as the malady, so extensive is the panacea, restoring to perfect soundness and health. This free gift I expect means salvation to all intents and purposes. Paul settles this in the 16th verse. "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so (no limit at all) by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." [Time expired.

[MR. POWER'S FOURTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Judges:* As the audience have been together a long time this afternoon, I will occupy but a short space. I will just glance at the gentleman's positions as he made them.

Respecting his remarks on the first Adam in opposition to the hereditary depravity of our nature, I shall make but a passing remark, and that merely to correct an error in regard to sentiments attributed to me, viz: that if a man should be a fiddler in this world, he would likewise be a fiddler in the future world. I would say that if any adult persons of our race, should indulge in any such business in this life and die in their sins, they would have no opportunity for fiddling in the future world. We shall notice this again by and by.

Again: He remarked that the resurrection affected the condition of the soul as well as the body. This I deny, and call on him for the proof to show where Paul affirms that the resurrection of the body effects a moral change on the soul.

I will here take the opportunity to lift the veil and show that the system that I oppose, holds, in opposition to all christian denominations, that the soul dies as well as the body and rests in the grave. [Here Mr. Doolittle denied that he held such a doctrine.] Well I am glad to learn that this is not the gentleman's belief. And I will now ask him where it is taught in any form, that the soul is sown in weakness and raised power, &c. Where is the text that teaches the resurrection of the moral character of any man, any different from what he possessed on earth? Mr.

D. remarked that we held that a man's immortality, holiness and happiness, &c. depends on his faith and good works in this life. But this not so. He here blended several points. We do not hold that a man's *immortality* has any thing to do with his obedience or disobedience in this life. But we maintain that man's holiness and happiness in a future world are suspended on his faith and obedience in this world.

With reference to his illustration of the wheat carried into market,—he mistook the case entirely. He began at the wrong end of the journey. If a man hears that wheat is a dollar a bushel in N. Y., the question is, "how shall I get my wheat there?" This is often a very important question with him. There is a heaven. But how can I get there? is the great inquiry. Does God require any thing at my hand in order that I may get there?

It is evident that the gentleman had a waving speech when on the floor. In reference to his quotation from Roman's—he spent all his strength in proving what we never denied. We do not believe that man could do any thing by which to merit heaven. But the question is, does God demand any thing of man that he may avail himself of the joys of heaven? God gives the husbandman his harvest—it is as much a free gift as salvation is—but does he expect to reap without using any means whatever to procure it! The man that would sit down and fold his arms, and yet expect that God would give him an abundant harvest would be considered a fit subject of a lunatic asylum. But such a man would be a philosopher in comparison to the man who should sit down and not ask what God would have him do that he might reap the rich harvest of eternal life—a life of blessedness in a future world.

It will be understood then that while we never maintained that man merits future happiness in heaven by his faith and obedience here. The system I oppose maintains the contrary, and here is the issue.

For proof of our position, I cite Matth. v. 11, 12, "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your

reward in heaven" They had great reward in heaven, but this was no more the reward of merit than an abundant harvest is the reward of merit to the husbandman. The reward is all of grace. A man cannot claim a temporal blessing at the hand of his Maker. Still he has blessings by fulfilling certain conditions. So God requires us to sow the spiritual seed, and if we do this we shall reap a spiritual harvest.

Again: He commented with some interest on Rom. v. 18. Now our view of this text is perfectly clear, on the old Bible platform, not on the new constitutional Adam and Christ, but the real Adam and Christ, the moral representatives of our race.

Adam fell and being the representative of man, the whole race became involved in guilt. "By the offence of one (Adam) judgment came upon all men to condemnation. So by the righteousness of one (Christ) the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." As natural and spiritual death came through Adam, so the resurrection for all, and spiritual life unconditionally for infants, come through Jesus Christ; and spiritual life to all adults who will receive it by faith.

Before I close I would remind the audience, that the gentlemen in his last speech, did not attempt to touch the difficulty I placed against his argument on the 15th of 1st Cor. that making Adam a constitutional nature, makes Christ an ideal being. He passed this without a solitary remark. And I tell you he will never meet this difficulty and remove it out of the way. He will have to retract his position or acknowledge that Christ is not a real person.

I now close by stating, the issue in the morning will be whether man's future condition depends at all on faith and obedience in this life. If I cannot show from the scripture that there is this dependence, I will give up the ground.



WEDNESDAY, JULY 30—9 O'CLOCK, A. M.

---

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S FIFTH SPEECH.]

As the hour has arrived for the discussion to commence this morning, for the information of those who were not here yesterday, it may be proper to read the question, and also briefly to refer to the course we have pursued thus far.

The question is, "Do the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, teach the ultimate holiness and happiness of the entire human race, in a state of immortality."

You will perceive the question has nothing to do with the state or condition of man in this world. No reference to, whether man is an accountable being, or a subject of moral government in the present life. This question travels beyond this life, and relates to the condition of man in the immortal state. What do the Scriptures teach concerning man's immortal condition beyond the grave. Hence all the questions affecting man's condition in this life have nothing to do with the question before us. And I very much regret, that thus far my friend has sustained the character as a debater, that I had heard attributed to him before, i. e. that he is very prone to avoid the question under debate—that his main skill lies in directing the attention from the point and drawing off his opponent from the proper question, to something else, foreign from the point. The gentleman I regret to say, has tried to pursue this course thus far in this discussion. And to justify himself in his course, he calls our attention to a remark connected with these questions, viz.—"The above questions open the entire system of Universalism and Orthodoxy, for free and full discussion." You will remark that Elder Power penned this as his opinion. But we are not bound to endorse his opinion. We claim the right to exercise our own reason and judgment in this matter. And

there is no man of good judgment and common sense that would put the construction that he has put on these questions open the field for the discussion of anything and any thing? By no means. We have conferred the discussion of certain questions, and what say? Do they embrace Total Depravity, Vicarious Atonement, the Trinity, &c., &c. By no means. If after going through the discussion of the questions before us, we choose to take up other subjects, we can do it, but while these questions before us let us attend to them.

The question before us you see relates to man's weal in the immortal state of existence, and has nothing to do with his condition in this world. Our friend lay undertook to draw off our attention from this, on the whole field of theology for debate. And the reason I can assign for this course is, his strong conviction that he is unable to grapple with the arguments we brought forward. For they were founded on ground against which the tempests of error may beat in. The truth cannot be shaken. If I had his ground I perhaps have taken the same course. This is the course one can pursue under such circumstances, to show no sign of an argument. But it is calculated to carry us far from the main point of the question.

I appeal to the Moderators on this question. We have chosen you to observe the rules by which we are to be governed and see them enforced. You are not to decide on the arguments, but decide questions of order, and see that the rules which we have drawn up. This you are to do is your duty, I do not remind you of this because you are not aware of it, but to have the matter presented in a correct light to the audience. [The rules were read which see.]

Now I expect gentlemen if our friend here manifests a disposition to wander from the point as he did yesterday, they will see that he is called back. He seemed to lose sight of the fact that I had the affirmative and that I was

in answer to the question, my business is to sustain the affirmative from the Scriptures,—my friends' business is to

examine my arguments and either admit their force, or prove them false. His business is to follow me, and not attempt to draw my attention off from the subject.

Yesterday my first argument was founded on the resurrection, the universality of the resurrection of all men to an immortal state of existence,—a state of holiness and happiness. This I proved from 1st Cor, 15, Paul there demonstrates the fact of the resurrection, "As in Adam all die even so in Christ shall all be made alive." My argument was that by the term Adam we are to understand what it means, the earthy man,—the earthly constitution of our race. All die in this earthy constitution or Adamic nature. And as they all die in this manner, so are all to be made alive in Christ, the heavenly image,—made alive from the two fold death in the Adamic nature. For I showed that this was a two fold death; 1st. we die physically; and 2nd., we die a moral or spiritual death. By being made alive in Christ, we are made free from all the consequences of this two fold death, which we die in Adam. As Paul says, "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption." But our friend tells us, this is only a resurrection of the body. But we say, it redeems the soul and body both from all corruption. The Apostle in telling us of this change, plainly tells us of the results of this change: "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory! O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" But to show us farther that this is a moral as well as physical change, the Apostle adds: "The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law." "But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory." Victory over what? Over all sin and every foe. To show farther that this change is both moral and physical, let us turn to the 8th of Rom. 21st verse, where Paul is refering to the same event: "Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Mark, this deliverance is from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God! This

accords with what Jesus Christ says, when they came to him to enquire of him about the resurrection: "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage. Neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the Angels, [are the Angels impure?] and are the children of God, being children of the resurrection. This is the language of the Savior, so you see we have proved clearly and definitely that the resurrection of the dead is both a moral and physical change. Physically, like Christ's glorious body—and spiritually like his image, the glory of God the Father. Thus as far as language can make a thing plain, we have proved this position, that the Scriptures do teach the ultimate holiness and happiness of the entire human race in a state of immortality. I called on my friend, to take hold of this chain and see if he could break it. Well he took it on his anvil, but what did he do. He said he found it to have one crooked link. But that he could not break. And he was mistaken about its having *one* crooked link. I am confident that he rests under the firm conviction, that he can no more move this argument, than he can shake the pillars of the universe. Hence his whole force and skill were employed to draw us from the question. He tried to lead us into the discussion of total depravity, or something else of a kindred nature. Every thing in the latitude of the question which he attempted to bring as an offset to this argument, was this simple passage from John v. 28, 29,—and I was surprised that he should bring it up here as it belongs to the other question, "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation."!! This has no reference at all to what Paul is speaking of in Cor. Christ was speaking of a moral and spiritual resurrection, that was to take place in the preaching of the Gospel. He tells us, the hour is coming, *and now is*, when all he is here speaking of, was to take place. But admitting that

the text has reference to man's immortal existence, (which I deny,) it proves too much for the gentleman; for his logic is, that which proves too much, proves nothing at all. Now, for the sake of the argument, I will admit he is correct. Well does it say, "they that have done good shall come forth to the resurrection of life." Now where will you find a man that has never done some good, at least one good act? Here it is promised, that they that have done good shall come forth to the resurrection of life. All have done some good; therefore, all shall come forth to the resurrection of life. "And they that have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation." All have done evil, so all shall come forth to the resurrection of damnation. Here then you have two resurrections, one of all to life, the other of all to damnation. But this is not the only difficulty in the way of my friends exposition of the text. Here is a portion of the human family, idiots and infants, that are incapable of doing either good or evil. They will be excluded from either of the two resurrections. What will be done with them I know not; probably my friend will place them in a state of betweenity. I leave him to solve this difficulty. The text has no reference to a physical resurrection in the future, but to what was taking place at that time, a moral and spiritual resurrection—from the moral degradation they were then in. They were like the dry bones spoken of by the Prophet, that should rise. Christ told the Pharisees they were as graves, like whited sepulchers. Such figures were common, and this passage is to be understood in the same sense.

[*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S FIFTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and the Audience*—I will spend a few moments in the first place, in examining Mr. D.'s comment on, and exposition of the questions and rules. He has announced to you, that the questions have reference exclusively to man's future condition, and do not by any possibility involve his condition in this state of being.—And then he charges, very modestly, (and I take it all in

good part,) that we must be a little destitute of common sense, to put the construction which we did on the postscript to the questions. This may require a little explanation.

With less acquaintance with the system than I have, I might have been a little surprised. But with the knowledge I possess of its character, of its manner of defence, or rather of retreat, and of the fact that its strong hold is in keeping its true character concealed from the public,—and learning that Mr. D. was an able defender of the system, (which character I fear he may tarnish this morning,) and knowing his principal defence to be in concealing the true system from the public eye, I therefore penned the P.S., that I might bring out the whole system. And before we engaged in this discussion, he signed this with his eyes open. So all his remarks about it are uncalled for.

The questions allow me, as the opponent of Universalism, to bring out all its strong points before this community. And they give him the same opportunity with my system. Now we hope that this explanation will save our worthy friend from any farther reference to these points.

I remark, secondly, with reference to his lesson of instruction to the honorable Judges, that the rules do not devolve it on them to make questions of order—this belongs to the disputants,—but to decide such questions as are referred to them.

It belongs to the negative to raise all the objections that can be raised, and to the affirmative to clear them up if possible. What have I been invited here for? To cover up Universalism, and hide its deformity! Would I have travelled some 400 miles, first and last, (for I made a fruitless journey here last spring for this purpose,) merely to cover up this corrupt system, and let it announce a complete victory? No. I understand I am invited here to take hold of the very foundations of this system, and, if I can, raze the lowest stone of its superstructure, and show that it is wholly unstained by the Bible. We expected to meet this morning and take hold of the system as it is, not to put in a plea to release it from all connection with this world. I presume the audience was disappointed to hear Mr. D. put in a suppliant plea for his system, instead

of a strong argument to sustain it. He should not be too uneasy about his system so soon, for if I am not mistaken, this is but the beginning of its calamities. He stands here before you and says I have not attended to his argument, that I have passed by them all. Now I challenge him to put his finger on a passage of Scripture, or an argument, which I have not examined. This whole community is witness, that I have examined every argument that he has adduced. But this is only another feature of the system I oppose—to get out of the hands of its opponent.

My friend has informed those who were not present before, what the question is, and the progress of the arguments thus far—that he had staked his affirmative on the general resurrection—that his first proof was found in the 15th of 1 Cor.—and he quoted from Rom. and other parts of the Scriptures, for proof corroborative of this. The audience who were present yesterday, will recollect how I treated this argument. But to stir up your minds by way of remembrance, and for the benefit of those who were not present yesterday, I will glance at it again.

He quoted, “As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.”—“This mortal shall put on immortality.” I wish you to mark this inspired declaration—*this mortal must put on immortality*. You recollect we joined issue on the main proof on which he staked his position. And this is the strongest ground he has. I stated that his application of this portion of Scripture, annihilated Christ from the world. He says Adam does not mean an individual—the man that sinned in the garden; but a natural human constitution, or earthy nature of every man. We showed, that in his application of this, he had to violate a universally acknowledged rule of interpretation, viz: that if one part of a text is to be understood figuratively, the other part of the same text is to be understood figuratively likewise. If Adam is a figurative, not a real man, but a mere earthy constitution; then Christ cannot be a real person, but a spiritual constitution belonging to man. So Christ as the great Redeemer and Savior of mankind, is banished from the world! I called upon him to meet this *difficulty*, but he did not touch it. And I lay this down as

an irrefutable answer, and am perfectly willing to leave it to the decision of this audience. And if he cannot get other proof than this contained in this chapter, he must give up the case. At least, to avail himself of any proof here, he must recant his position, (and I have so much of the milk of kindness about me, I will give him perfect liberty to do it,) and take the ground that Adam means the literal Adam, and Christ means the literal Christ. If he does not do this, he must say that we are not saved by a literal Christ, but by some element in our own constitution.

But this is not the only difficulty. I showed that this resurrection only referred to the body. I asked him to show us where the Bible said the soul was sown in weakness and raised in power, &c. But he saw fit to pass this point without notice. But if he does come to it, he will plunge his system into a difficulty, from which it cannot be extricated.

Mark, this resurrection refers to the body *alone*, or to the body and *soul both*. If he says it refers to the body alone, he yields his point, and his system goes with it. But as this is the most plausible ground he has to stand on, he will, to save his system, make it include the soul. Then his system, as I intimated before, holds to the *mortality* of the soul. But Mr. D. said this was not his belief. Well, he may take it back if he chooses. But he must, if he holds to his argument, hold that the soul is mortal; for it is to put on immortality. But how could the soul put on immortality if it always had it on, and never was mortal? So you see plainly, if he would have his main proof text avail him anything, he must take the ground that the soul is mortal as well as the body.

A few words in reference to his remarks on John v. 28, 29. The gentleman I suppose was innocent, but he misquoted the text; he added, *and now is*, which clause does not belong to this text, and he can never get it into the text. The Savior is evidently discoursing about the moral condition of men in the verses preceding, as will be seen by commencing to read at the 20th verse; he says, verse 25: "the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God"—i. e. they shall believe on



the son of God—"and they that hear [believe] shall live." And as some were greatly astonished that Christ should possess such power and authority, he adds—"Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming [not now is] in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation"—showing, that he had not only power to raise them from spiritual death in this world, but also to raise their bodies from the grave at the last day, and assign every one his place according to his works, and moral character.

My friend started the difficulty—that all had done some good, and some evil; and, therefore, there would be a double resurrection. But the difficulty here lies in his view of the subject, of what constitutes doing good or evil. What is here meant by doing good is, believing on the Son of God, and obeying him; by doing which, they become subjects of a spiritual resurrection, and heirs to a crown of life at the last day. Doing evil, in the text means, to reject Christ; and such as do this, are condemned to eternal punishment in the future world.

In the case of idiots and infants, I will remove the objection. And he need not fear I shall use up my affirmative, though to remove this objection, I refer to Rev. xx. 12, "And I saw the dead small and great stand before God." Here you see the *small*, or infants, are raised! Now will the gentleman say I have avoided his main point in proof of his affirmative?—[*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S SIXTH SPEECH.]

While the matter is fresh in my mind, I will turn to the passage in John again. I am accused of misquoting language in the text. I did not quote it as in the text but in the context.

I will turn your attention to it once more, to show you that my friend is laboring under a serious mistake, you will perceive from the context, that Christ was speaking of the moral effects that were resulting from the preach-

ing of the gospel,—of a resurrection effected by the power of the word at that time, in that generation, and has no reference to the immortal condition of man in a future world. Says Christ, “verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming [will continue to come] and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.” Now, does Christ here mean the literal dead or the spiritually? Without any doubt the latter; for he says, the time is coming *and now is*, when they that hear the gospel shall live and receive it, shall be purified and live in a moral sense. “For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given the Son to have life in himself, and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.”

Then the Savior to speak more definitely and extensively still, relatively to this change, says “Marvel not at this for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice.” Having reference to their moral condition. This is plainly the meaning, as will be seen by reference to other passages. Christ compared the Pharisees, on account of their sins and hypocrisy, to graves,—whited sepulchers. “So the Prophet Ezekiel uses the same language, the Savior here uses in reference to the moral state of the Jews, when he refers to the valley of dry bones. I will read two or three verses. “Then he said unto me, son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel, behold they say our bones are dried and our hope is lost, we are cut off from our parts. Therefore prophesy and say unto them, thus saith the Lord God, behold O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves O my people, and brought you up out of your graves. And shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live; and I shall place you in your own land; then shall ye know that I Lord have spoken it, and performed it, saith the Lord,” Ezek. xxxvii. 11—14 vs. Here no one can doubt that this refers to a moral state,—that the Jews were in their graves of sin, buried in sin.

Will they never be raised from their graves. Now the

Savior has reference to the same thing, to being buried in sin when he uses the figure of the grave. Some had been waiting for the Messiah, and when he came, they believed on him and were raised out of this state of moral slumber and death.

There were others that came forth to the resurrection of damnation, i. e. they became his murderers, they crucified him. This is what is meant by coming forth to the resurrection of damnation. And this is so understood by some of the best commentators in our land. It has no reference whatever to an immortal state.

The gentleman says he was invited here to take hold of the very foundation of our system—not to take hold of any one point and be confined to it, but seize on every thing connected with universalism, to grapple with the whole system. I am glad he feels this responsibility resting on him, and hope he will take hold like a man. I have no fear of the consequence. But as to the main pillars, he has not yet taken hold on them,—neither will he lay his hand on them. He might as well lay hold on the pillars of the universe. They are as firm as the eternal throne.

These pillars are the existence of one God—the perfection of all his attributes—faith in Jesus Christ, as the Savior of the world—that he will fully accomplish his mission—that all men will attain happiness and holiness, in a state of immortality. Now if he has come to grapple on these main pillars, why does he not take hold on them. Why does he not take hold on our views of the character of God, of his revealed will to man—these main pillars and show that our doctrine is false—that the doctrine of the holiness and happiness of the entire human race is at war with the character of God—at war with the character of Jesus Christ and with the object of his mission to earth—at war with the Bible—with the best wishes of mankind.—Why does he not take hold of these pillars? He will never do it.

But he has manifested considerable sympathy for me, and tried to excite your compassion in my favor,—stating that I made a very suppliant speech—that I wanted to beg

off—that I was afraid to present the whole system—almost ready to beg and intreat, that he would not go into a general investigation,—that I was afraid he would make known some of its dangerous points. This is all for effect. As far as any fear is concerned, I should be glad to stand here for six months, and discuss the whole ground of Universalism and Methodism. I have no fears as to the result. We are the last people in the world, that would smother free discussion. The great difficulty, is free discussion, has been avoided by the opposite side. And no one would have come into the field, to oppose our system, unless their friend's had driven them to it, by telling them that our doctrine, was gaining great reputation and rapidly spreading, that their faith was in danger, and they must enter the field, and try to show that Universalism is false, or the whole world would embrace it. Public opinion has driven them to this, and I am glad it is so. I want to keep nothing in the dark. I want our whole system brought out to view, that all may see it, and embrace the truth.

The Gentleman challenged me, to lay my finger on any point of the argument, he has not examined. I ask if he has taken hold, on any part of my argument, as a man should take hold of it, and shown that it does not prove the holiness and happiness, of the entire human race, in a state of immortality? I challenged him to lay hold of this chain of testimony and show that all men, who are raised in glory, in power and in incorruption, will not be happy.

"I will," says he "lay this chain on my anvil, and see if it can be broken." Well he laid it there, and found he says one crooked link, but even that he could not brake. And he was mistaken, about the crooked link, it was only a defect in his perception. The whole chain is sound and cannot be broken.

Adam, he finds fault with my definition of the term Adam. But I gave the Bible, and the correct definition of term. Nearly all proper names in the Bible, have some signification peculiar to themselves. So the term Adam means *Earthy. Red, Redman or man of the Earth.* Now why was the first man called Adam, *earthy man*? Because he was made of the Earth.

Again, I said, the first man, clothed in this earthly constitution, stood as the representative of the human race. He sinned and became subject to temporal and spiritual death. To natural death, by a law of physical nature, and to spiritual death, in consequence of the violation of the moral law. So he died a two-fold death. You will mark the scripture, "as in Adam all die,"—in the present tense, not in the past tense. Not "In Adam's fall we sinned all"—all *die*, not *died*,—because all sin in the Adamic or earthly nature.

Adam is the representative of man in his earthy nature, and Christ is the representative of man in his spiritual or heavenly nature.—Hence, says the Apostle: "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall be made alive." "Behold I shew you a mystery, we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." Now the question is—What shall be the condition of all men when thus changed? Our friend says this is to be a physical change, affecting the body only. But does Paul say so? By no means. Now mark his language, and see what shall be the result of this universal change. "When this mortal shall have put on immortality." Then cometh the end when Christ shall have completed the object of his mission. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death—then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?" To show that this change is both moral as well as physical, he adds: "The sting of death is sin." But all will exclaim, O death where is thy sting. The sting (sin) is no longer to be felt, it is taken away, and there is a complete victory over every foe. And all shout, "Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ." All are raised in honor, in glory, in power, and are as the Savior says, "Equal to the Angels." And yet our friend says, many of them will be like devils, and not like angels. He says, all who die *sinner*s will be raised up *sinner*s; but the Savior says,

will be "equal unto the angels." Who shall we be—Elder Power, or Christ? I did not believe in the mortality of the soul. But to believe: that the resurrection of the whole man taken of here, is a full salvation; which moulds man in the image of Christ, and renders him pure and holy, subject for the society of heaven.—[*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S SIXTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and the Audience*—In looking at the ground occupied by my worthy friend Mr. D., I cannot but have perceived the perfectly unsuccessful attempt he made, to meet my counter proof. I referred to the resurrection mentioned in John. To prove his point, he referred to Ezk. Now the passage in Ezk. is wholly confined to the house of Israel; while in John, the terms are not the least restriction, but have reference to the whole human family. Again: in the prophecy of Ezk. the Lord tells the prophet, this is not a literal resurrection, but has reference to their political state; while in John, the Redeemer refers to the Divine will towards men—that he will raise them; and the moral character they possess when raised, will fix their destiny for eternity. Again, the argument, which involves a contradiction in itself, is unsound; and this is the case with the gentleman's. He says this is a figurative resurrection. Now mark what results from this interpretation: "The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves [in a state of moral corruption] shall come forth; [from their corruption,] they that have done good, [in this corruption] to the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of condemnation"—i. e. they that have done evil, are in corruption and shall be raised out of corruption, into a state of condemnation or corruption again, in this life, just as they were before. This is an absurdity too gross to be tolerated for a moment.

He then made an effort which was equally unsuccessful, in his leading argument on the general resurrection. As we will give a passing notice. He was almost tempt-

ed to change his position. He says, Adam was the representative of the whole human race. Now I noted down his remark in his first speech, on this subject; which was, that Adam did not mean a literal man, but only the constitutional earthy nature of all men. The ladder was too short for his difficulty. He knew it would not do to take his old ground exactly, so he says Adam was a literal man, the representative of the human race.

Now we will follow up this point. And we will see yet, that in order to save his argument, he has to annihilate Christ. Now that system that involves an absurdity, and contradicts the whole Scriptures must be false. But his theory contradicts the whole word of God. He would have us infer that there is a kind of constitution laid up in heaven somewhere, that is to save us all; but whatever it may be, it is not the literal Christ. And the Bible says, "there is no other name under heaven whereby men can be saved." Hence you see, the gentleman must come to the rescue of his argument; for it is prostrated, or leave the whole world without hope in Christ.

He made a labored effort, but fell short of what I had anticipated, to show that his respondent and Paul were at issue. His effort was wholly unsuccessful. My position was, if he applied the resurrection spoken of in 1 Cor., 15, to the body alone, his argument would fail. So he has to apply it to the body and soul both. But did he show that Paul and I were at issue? Verily he did not.

And now I bring him again to the point I have had up before. He must show, if the soul puts on immortality, that it did not possess it before, or that it now has a double immortality. But this is a doctrine the Bible knows nothing of. Well he has fully conceded the point to us, (and I was glad to hear him,) to take hold of the pillars of Universalism, and bring out its strong points. And as it affords him so much pleasure to think I am ready to do it, I hope you will not be detained again with the complaint, that I am departing from the point.

He says we believe in the one Supreme God, and in Jesus Christ, as declared in the Bible, to be the Saviour of the world. He claims this to be a peculiarity of Universalism!

But this is not the fact, by any means. This is not the issue. I am not coming before you, to prove there is no Jehovah, or Savior of the world! But here lies the issue, at the very bottom and foundation of the whole superstructure, viz: the system maintains that God is such a Being, that He has released man from all responsibility of faith, love, obedience, or holiness in *this world*—and that man, will as certainly be saved in Heaven, by rejecting Christ the Savior of the world, as if he should believe on him with all his heart.

Another peculiar feature of the system is—and mark, it is the foundation stone—take this away and the whole building falls to the ground—take it away and Universalism vanishes as a vapor; it is the very soul of the system to maintain, and all who hold this theory, if they are consistent with their system, maintain and teach, that men may disbelieve in the one Supreme God, and Jesus Christ whom He has sent—may blaspheme his infinite and holy name—throw off all moral restraint, and yet be unconditionally sure of heaven and eternal happiness. This is the pillar I am feeling after, and I hope to force it from its foundation, and let the whole temple fall into its merited ruin.

Mr. D. refers again to my art as a blacksmith. I would not allude to this further, if it were not for his frequent use of it. He said I did not break his chain. I perceive my friend D. has very little knowledge of this art, and I think I shall show you, that he has less skill as a theologian. I have taken the hammer of truth, and applied it to his chain, and you see it will take the gentleman an age to gather up the fragments. And I will work up his theological chains just as fast as he can bring them on. I will do it by the day, or by the job. Bring on your metal, Mr. D., as fast as you please.

But to the argument. Friend D., you remember, rejoiced that we were coming to take hold of the pillars of this system; and as it is a matter of rejoicing to him, we the more cheerfully set about it.

We have shown that to believe in God, as the Sovereign of the Universe, and Jesus Christ as the Savior of the world, is not a peculiarity of Universalism. Its peculiari-



ty consists in teaching that men may reject all the truths of the Bible, disregard every moral obligation, violate every moral principle that is revealed in the Bible, and die in moral degradation and sin; and yet, they are as sure of heaven as if they were already in its enjoyment.

The foundation of Universalism is, in maintaining that God releases man in this world from all obligation, as a condition or means of salvation in heaven. Now I will show that this contradicts the word of God, and must be false; for the Word of God will not contradict itself. To show that the Bible does require faith in man in this world, as a condition or means of his salvation hereafter, I quote John iii. 14—18: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him, is not condemned: but he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." Again, the 36th verse: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." Again, John vi. 27—29: "Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him hath God the Father sealed. Then said they unto him, What shall we do, that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." That this refers to the future state, is evident from the 40th verse: "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day." Again, John viii. 21—24: "Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins; whither I go, ye cannot come. Then said the Jews, Will he kill

himself! because he saith, Whither I go, ye cannot come. And he said unto them, Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world. I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins; for if ye believe not that I am *he*, ye shall die in your sins." These texts I bring, as clear Scripture testimony, to disprove this feature of Universalism, viz: that God releases man from all obligation in this world, relative to his condition in a future world.

[Here Mr. Doolittle arose, and said the gentleman was not in order, and read the first question again, to show it had nothing to do with man's faith or practice in this world. After some discussion, a majority of the Judges decided that Mr. Power was in order.]

I have a few moments left, and I will spend them in glancing at my position. I have adduced in my proper place, occupying the negative, counter proof against the system which I oppose, and to show that it does not stand by the word of God. I have adduced a class of Scriptures, to show that God has suspended man's eternal salvation, on condition of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

[*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S SEVENTH SPEECH.]

In reference to my remarks on the passage in John v., the gentleman represents me as saying, that this was a figurative resurrection. I think I said it was a spiritual and moral resurrection—from a state of moral death—in which condition in sin, individuals were represented as being in their graves. The word graves is used figuratively, not literally, denoting a state of moral and spiritual degradation, into which men were sunk; and this resurrection was to take them out of that state of degradation, and raise them to spiritual life.

This whole passage has reference to what was transpiring in the age. The resurrection Christ speaks of, has reference, as I have said, to a spiritual and moral change on earth, and not to a state of immortality in a future world. It has no reference to the resurrection spoken of

in 1 Cor. 15th. This was what I shewed. The construction which the gentleman puts on it, makes this absurdity: he would raise all to life and all to damnation; that is, there is not an individual who has not done some good, and they (all that have done good) shall come forth to the resurrection of life—they that have done evil (and all have done evil) shall come forth to the resurrection of damnation. So we see that in applying this to the immortal state we have this monstrous absurdity—that all are raised to eternal salvation, and all to eternal damnation. And as infants and idiots have never done good or evil, they will be excluded from any resurrection, and all others will have a double resurrection.

Again, the gentleman takes much pains to establish this position—that any argument that is opposed to the Word of God, and contradicts itself, is absurd. I should not think it needs much labor to prove this. We perfectly agree on this principle. But whether he or I advances such arguments, you my friends, are to judge.

Again, he challenges me to prove that he and Paul are at issue. Well, we accept the challenge, and proceed to give the proof. We have shown clearly and conclusively with respect to the subject of the resurrection, that our friend and Paul are at issue—that they take two directly opposite positions, as opposite as the poles, as different as light and darkness. The position our friend Power takes on the doctrine of the resurrection is, that the resurrection, the highest, most glorious, and most perfect and entire change described in God's Word, does not change or affect the moral condition of man—does not touch the condition of the soul—that it has reference only to the body. But the position taken by Paul is, that the resurrection of the whole human family is a state of complete exemption and freedom from all sin, pain, infirmity and suffering, and every evil both physical and moral—that it clothes the whole human family with incorruption and immortality, and places them in honor, in power and glory, where they will all rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, and shout, O death where is thy sting! and O grave where is thy victory! and give thanks to God for the victory over

every foe both to God and man, through our Lord Jesus Christ. The Apostle adds, by way of explanation, "The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law: But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ"—Here, too, implying, that Jesus Christ is the agency in raising all men from a state of corruption, dishonor and weakness, and clothing them with power and glory, incorruption and immortality, and placing them on an equality with the Angels, making them children of God, being children of the resurrection, and not subject to death any more.—This then, is an entire change, giving entire freedom from sin and suffering, from physical and moral evils of every kind—a change, which will fashion their vile bodies into the likeness of Christ's own glorious body, and our moral natures into the express image and likeness of the moral character of Jesus Christ. Hence the Savior says, "I am the resurrection and the life." Thus you see, that the gentleman and Paul are at issue; and now shall we take Elder Power's position or Paul's, as the true position? The gentleman glanced at this position and then passed by it, and I doubt not he will try to get still farther from it, for he dare not meet it in the face. He sees his difficulty.

Another position I took, which the gentleman has not examined, was, that it was God's absolute purpose and revealed will, that all men should become holy and happy in an immortal state of existence. This I proved yesterday, but will call your attention to it again.

With respect to the will of God, I quoted 1 Tim. ii. 4: "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth." "For (to this end, adds Paul,) there is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ; who gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time."—i. e. it shall be made manifest in the end, that Christ gave himself a ransom, died for all mankind, for their redemption, and ultimate holiness and salvation, that the will of God might be accomplished—that all men should be saved. And this was to take place when the dead are raised, and Death, the last enemy is destroyed. Here I want you to understand where the pro-

mise is made that death shall be destroyed. It is found in Isaiah xxv. 7, 8: "And he, Jehovah, will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the vail that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall be taken away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it." Such, my friends, is the will of God toward all people. He will wipe tears from off all faces. Again, we have God's will recorded in Ephes. i. 8—10: "Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence: Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: That in the dispensation of the fullness of time, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth; even in him." Now we find that this will of God, with respect to the final gathering of all things in Christ, is a will of *purpose*. And in respect to this purpose, as Dr. Adam Clark says, he did not consult men, angels, or devils—it was his own eternal purpose, that all men should be saved. Now, if all men are not saved, then God will be disappointed! and there is some power able to frustrate the will of God! But can this be done? No; no one can turn back the hand of God. "My counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure." And Paul tells us, that He worketh all things (in relation to the salvation of all men) according to the counsel of his own will. Now, if you say this will not be done, that men will not be saved, then you say that God's *will* will be frustrated by some power; which is most monstrously absurd. We want the gentleman to bear this argument in mind, and take it in hand, and see if it is false.

The gentleman made some very strange observations in his last speech; and they seem the more strange to me, because from what I had heard of the many opportunities he had had of forming correct conclusions. I had supposed he could represent us a little more correctly. He came forward here, and said we released all men from any obligation to love and serve God, in this world. He says too, we tell men from the pulpit, that they may cast off all fear,

to on in all manner of crime in the world. Now I ask this respected audience, if any of you ever saw a Universalist preacher teach such a doctrine as this from the pulpit? Have you ever seen it in any of our books? I pronounce the statement unqualifiedly false, and challenge the gentleman to prove it.

I said, yesterday, that God held men responsible to love and obey him, and to love their neighbors as themselves. If there is any doctrine that we hold sacred it is this.

We never advocated any other doctrine. It is a gross perversion—is slanderous and false, to make a charge, that we do. I say this in all calmness and moderation, and I should wish to be treated in the same manner, should I bring such a false and slanderous charge against our Methodist friend.

Now I wish to be distinctly understood, that we hold as true as our friend does, that all men are under obligation to love and obey God, and respect all the rights of their fellow-men. We hold that they will be punished to the extent they deserve, for every violation of this obligation. But at the same time, we do not attach the same importance to this, which he does. We do not believe that man has promised or threatened endless happiness or endless punishment for what men may do in this world.

We look upon faith and good works as a great good in this world, but we do not believe that endless reward is attached to a man's faith and good works in this life. We do not believe that immortal life and happiness are bestowed on the Christian on the score of merit, or of good works here. Salvation is the gift of God's unmerited mercy. When we get home, we shall shout *Grace, Grace, Grace*. Yes, salvation is all of Grace, from the foundation to the topmost stone.

Our Power says, that everlasting life is predicated on

Now, my friends, I want you to understand in what sense the phrase *life*, and *eternal life*, are used in the New Testament. You ought to know that everlasting life is to be enjoyed in the present tense, by believing and accepting the Gospel. For proof of this, we read John xvii. and this is life eternal, that they might know the only

true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." Again, says Christ, "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." He *hath* it, in the present tense. Again, John v. 24: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed [mark] from death unto life." "The words that I speak, they are spirit and they are life." You see this everlasting life which my friend quoted, is said to be enjoyed by the believer in this world, as the consequence of faith in the Son of God. "He that believeth on me, *hath* everlasting life." Now what one *has*, does he want to go into the future world to *get*? This everlasting life has no reference to life in the immortal state; it has reference to this world alone."—[*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S SEVENTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators and the Audience:*—It may be necessary first to settle a matter, that according to the gentleman's version of it, certainly assumes a very serious aspect. He has brought the charge against me personally, made it a direct personal matter, of public falsehood and slander. I take all this patiently, but I give notice in advance, that I must be excused from following the gentleman's example, in turning the main question at issue, into direct personal charges. I have no use for such material, in my counter proof. But as my worthy friend, has brought this charge of public slander and falsehood against me for a statement I made, I will repeat my statement correctly, and see if we cannot have this question settled.

I have charged on Universalism, that it maintains, that men may live in all kinds of infidelity, wickedness, atheism,—indulge in all manner of crimes through life, and commit suicide at last, and yet go unconditionally to heaven. Now this charge, is either true or false. If it is true, then there was no ground, on which to base the charge of falsehood and slander against me. If it is not true, then it will follow that crimes unrepented of will keep men out of heaven, and Universalism is false. Now I

have a right to ask you, Mr. Doolittle, does not Universalism, maintain that no possible crime that men can commit, can keep them out of heaven? [Mr. Doolittle. "I will observe that this is another question. We believe, as does the gentleman, that the chief of sinners may be saved."] I did not ask the gentleman to make a speech, but to answer the question directly. [Mr. D., I said you brought the charge, that our public preachers, told men from the pulpit, that they might go on in all the sin they pleased till death, and it would not keep them out of heaven.] Well does not your system maintain that? [Mr. D., this is not the question at this time.]

Well gentleman Moderators:—the gentleman shrinks from answering the question. he is bound in honour to answer. He has declined and publicly refused to answer it. And now I make this assertion before this community, and he is bound in justice to his system, and in courtesy to this community, to correct my statement if it is false. I make this statement openly and publicly,—that *Universalism does maintain, that a man may be guilty of falsehood, of perjury, of seduction, of adultery, of theft, of robbery, of murder, of infidelity, of blasphemy, of atheism, and of all these crimes, in the most aggravated forms, indulged in through life, and that he may consummate his crimes by suicide, and rush into eternity, possessing this moral character, and yet be unconditionally sure of heaven in a future world.*

Now I make this public declaration, and the gentleman is bound, if his system does not maintain this, to make it clear before this community. But I claim that I am correct here, and state the fundamental features of the system which I oppose.

If the charge is, that I am guilty of falsehood and slander, in saying that the preachers of this doctrine teach this—if I am in error in this, it only aggravates their difficulty; if they do not preach this, then they do not preach their own system. They impose on the unsuspecting public, and preach something else besides their real sentiments. It may be I am mistaken,—though I deny the charge of slander—it may be they do not preach their



doctrine, that they preach one thing, and hold a system different in all respects. It may be that they dare not preach all the features of their doctrine, lest its gross infidelity should be too manifest, and but few would receive it. It may be that the preachers have not as much honesty as I had accredited to them, to preach their true system. Let the gentleman show that they do not preach this doctrine, and I will publicly acknowledge, that they are not as honest as I had supposed. But let him bear in mind that the moment he convicts me of slander in this, he will convict himself, and all who pretend to teach the doctrine he holds, of concealing their real system, and teaching another, to deceive the public.

I now pass to some other points. But would remark here, that an adjournment seems to help my friend much. It makes his first speech after it altogether the best one. But to the subject. First the passage in John. He tried to diminish the force of my argument, from this passage. And it was a repetition, I believe for the third time. You recollect he stated that they, that had done good in their figurative graves,—though he had just denied that he used the term figurative, yet he had to bring in the word *figurative* after all. And you will find, if he figures away this passage, he will have to figure pretty largely,—they that have done good in their figurative graves of corruption, of sin, shall come forth unto the resurrection of spiritual life. But let us apply this rule of interpretation to, the latter part of the passage, it will read, “they that have done evil in the figurative graves of corruption, shall come forth to a spiritual resurrection of damnation.” But what state were such in before they were raised? Why in a state of damnation. And what are they raised to? Why to a state of damnation. Now a system that makes such ridiculous nonsense of the word of God as this, must be utterly false and unsound.

Mr. D., tried to raise the difficulty again, that I would make a double resurrection—one to life and the other to damnation. You recollect I showed, that those who are raised to life, are those who have believed on Jesus Christ, and followed him in holy living in this life—that all such

will be raised literally to eternal glory, at the end of time, and they that have done evil, those who have lived in practical unbelief and sin, rejecting the Savior through life and in death, shall rise literally, to a state of condemnation, with the wrath of God abiding on them forever.

I was surprised, that he should start the question again about infants and idiots, after I had quoted the passage, where it declares the dead small and great, should in the resurrection, stand before God, including all infants and idiots as well as others,

Again, that my friend and the Bible are at issue, I have only to refer you to my argument concerning the resurrection, and the difficulties there placed in his way. I have shown you, (and certainly the audience—will have this part of the gentlemen's argument by heart,) that he has to reject Jesus Christ, making him only an ideal something. Whereas the Bible, every where represents him as a real person, God manifest in the flesh. Here you see, Mr. D. and the Bible are in direct opposition. And I repeat, that a system which contradicts the Bible, as plainly as this does must be false.

Again, we remind you, that we denied that this resurrection, had reference to the soul, on this principle. That if it is applied to the soul, it must make the soul mortal. If "this mortal must put on immortality," including the soul, the soul must now be mortal. Hence we say, his argument here falls infinitely short of sustaining his position. And we shall repeat this reply to this argument of his, as often as he brings it up. Unless at least, he brings it up in some different form.

Again, the Divine will. We have already remarked, that the question whether the divine Being has a will and purpose, is not the point in debate: but, the question is, has this Divine purpose fixed the moral character of all men, in a future world, without any conditions or regard to his character here? The gentleman has to take this position, but he has failed to adduce the proof. He referred again, to 1 Tim. 2:3. And again we ask the question: Is the will of God absolute in this case? Is it the will of God, that all men should come to the knowledge of the

truth in this world? Matter of fact, shows that all do not come to the knowledge of the truth in this world. Then in order to make the will of God absolute, in regard to man on earth, he must take the ground, that the very reason why men are living in error, in sin and in blasphemy, is, that it is God's will and purpose, that they should thus live. Who will take this ground. While the very language of God is "Look unto me all ye ends of the earth and be saved"? It is plain then the will of God is not absolute here.

Again, Mr. D. made quite a flourish on the 25th of Isa. Now the scene the prophet describes there, means something in this world, or something in the future world, or something that refers to both worlds. If he takes the ground, that the scene is confined to this world, he yields the whole question and gives up the point. If he admits that it applies both to this and the future world, the conclusion is the same. Then the only alternative for him, is to confine it to the immortal state in the future world. Well let us look at it in this light. The tenth verse reads, "For in this mountain shall the hand of the Lord rest, and Moab shall be trodden down under him, even as straw is trodden down for the dung-hill." What a splendid scene, the gentleman will have in the immortal world, Moab shall there be trodden down as straw on the dung-hill. And these, mark, are scenes in the heavenly world! Would the prophet ever utter such a monstrous absurdity as this! Impossible! Then this all belongs to this world, and refers to the spread of the Gospel among the nations of the earth.

My friend in speaking of the resurrection, has several times, referred to the angels of God,—that those raised are equal to the angels, are the children of God, being children of the resurrection. Now it is plain, that he gets no support from this. The declaration of our Savior, at this time has reference alone to men's relative condition in the future world. The Sadducees who denied the resurrection, brought up the case of a woman, who had seven husbands, and wanted to know whose wife she should be in the resurrection. The Savior told them that in the resurrection state they neither marry nor are given in mar-

, neither can they die any more, for they are equal to the angels,—referring to the relative condition of—the angels did not marry, neither should they. They should be the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now, if there is any thing here which he can derive any support, it is the assumption to be a child of God in any sense, is to be holy and righteous. If he takes this ground, we are prepared to show that men in this relation are not always made holy and righteous.

Friend D., has attempted to start a difficulty—and it is only point on which he can plant himself, in hostility or counter proof. He says, everlasting life is enjoyed in the present tense ; and from this he concludes, it have no reference to the future world. Now this everlasting life is either enjoyed *alone* in this world, and men entirely destitute of it in the future state, or it is to be enjoyed here and is consummated in the future world. If he confines it to this world, then if he gets men saved at all, it is without eternal life. If he chooses not to take this ground, he must admit that this everlasting life commences here in the believer in Christ, and is perpetuated eternally.

Before sitting down, I will call Mr. D.'s attention to the argument I made—whether I represented his system correctly—whether men can commit any sins that will keep them out of heaven?—[*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S EIGHTH SPEECH.]

With respect to this point, my friends, the charge which our Power brought against the public teachers of Universalism, we say he has not yet proved it. He charges public advocates of Universalism, with telling men in the pulpit, that they may cast off all fear of God, live in all manner of crimes, and yet be just as sure of heaven, as if already there. This is the substance of the charge, though he added a great many more words, making it much more glaring. This, we repeat again, is a false and slanderous charge.

The gentleman, when he arose said, "I now call on Mr. Doolittle to say whether the system of Universalism does not hold, that men may live and die in all manner of crimes, and yet be sure of heaven?" Now I would ask my friend, if *he* does not believe that men may commit all manner of sin, and yet be sure to go to heaven? Says Paul, "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of which I am chief." Now if the *chief of sinners* could be saved, why not others who are less than the chief? We do believe, that persons dying in their sins, may be saved by the Grace of God; this we hold. But we do not hold that men may go on in sin, and do all manner of wickedness, and escape the final punishment due to their crimes, and be saved irrespective of moral character.

The great cardinal point on which we are at issue, is this: that all men, that every rational being, may be saved, and will be saved; but not without reference to their moral character. We do not believe they will be saved *in* their sins. We believe they will be purified from all sin. We hold and believe, and proclaim it to the world, that the chief of sinners will be saved—that God will gather together, as says Paul, in one all things in Christ. How gather them together? In their sins. No. He that is in Christ is a new creature—he is born again, made holy and fit for heaven. The salvation which we hold to, is a salvation from *sin*, from *all* sin, yea from every corruption, and from every evil both physical and moral. And we believe that a man, though he may be so blind a prodigal, so far wandered from his father's house as to go great lengths in sin, and even blaspheme the name of his Maker, and die a suicide,—that such a man, by the infinite and abounding grace, love and mercy of God, when His arm is stretched out and mighty to save—and His arm is not shortened that it cannot save—that even such a man may be saved. But we do not believe that men are saved *in* their sins, as our friend would try to make you think, nor without any means of Grace.

I hold in my hand the profession of faith of the Universalists denomination. And to show you from this, what

And on this point, I will read, Art. 9, *Concerning Repentance, Faith, and Love*:

We believe according to the divine doctrine and teaching of Christ and his Apostles, that repentance to God for sin, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and love to God and our fellow creatures, are means of Grace granted by God, and essential to our salvation and glory.

"Matt. iv. 16, and xxii. 37, 40; Mark i. 15; Acts i. viii. 31, and xx. 21; Heb. xi. 6; 1 John iii, 24, 25."

Now this charge of the gentleman, with all respect to me, we pronounce false—because it is so. We do not think he would bring a false charge willfully or design-

It is for the want of light that he has done it; and if sin of ignorance is to be winked at, we will let this one pass.

Now, a word about the resurrection. My friend says, I hear of this very often. Well, I told him yesterday, his argument should haunt him, and I mean it shall. His argument is a chain that cannot be broken. I quoted the 20th Chap. of Luke, to show what would be the condition of man in the resurrection from the dead—that they would be like the angels, sinless and pure—that they are not subject to death any more, but are the children of God, the children of the resurrection. This is a complete redemption and deliverance, as Paul says in the 8th of Romans, from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. And what will be the crowning scene of all this? "Death the last enemy is destroyed." "Death is swallowed up in victory." "Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death shall be allowed up in victory." Where is this written? In the most glorious passages found in the Bible. And he applies it to the future world—he quotes from it, to show what will be the condition of men in the resurrection, showing conclusively that he understands this passage as applying to the future state. And here Mr. Powell and Paul are at issue.

But our friend would have all the scenes described in the passage, (Isaiah, 25) confined to this world—would have the mountain here spoken of, only a mountain in

Judea. Now it is customary for the prophets to speak of the place of God's peculiar manifestation of his glory and power, as a mountain of the Lord. All learned commentators would tell you the same. Now, in this mountain, the place of God's peculiar manifestation, shall the Lord of hosts make unto *all people* a feast of fat things—a rich spiritual feast shall be provided. But God shall do something more—he will destroy the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. By this covering, this veil, is meant the moral covering of corruption and darkness; this shall be destroyed, cast off forever from all people and nations. He will swallow up death in victory, and thus destroy the last enemy—he will wipe away tears from off *all faces*—for the Lord hath spoken it. And from this chapter Paul quotes, and applies it to the immortal state: "Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, (in Isaiah 25, which refers to the mountain of God's holiness,) Death is swallowed up in victory." Then shall be fulfilled the glorious promise that God shall wipe the tears from every weeping eye, and pains, and groans and tears, shall no longer be known. So says Paul, and so would Elder Power, if he could have the mist of darkness dispelled from him, and see things as they are. And it is really strange I think, that my friend is not already converted. It would seem that he either has a very obtuse intellect, or that he is stubborn and unwilling to be convinced, for he does still adhere to his old view. But I do think that the conviction rests upon his mind, that these arguments are irrefutable; for he has not refuted them. He has kept as near them as he could, and not touch them. He knew that it would not do to go too far from them, but he has not dared to take hold of them. But I will let this matter pass, and come to another argument,—On the restitution of all things. And on this, I will quote Dr. Adam Clark, an able and most learned commentator. I would have it understood, however, that we do not go with him in all his length and breadth. There is something peculiar about him. He seems sometimes to be on right ground, and then again to involve himself in the same darkness

and difficulty that our friend Power does. The fact is, that Dr. Adam Clark, when he was let loose from his creed, and from the bias of his early education—when he spake the honest conviction of his soul, on these great proof texts, of the future destiny of man—he spake the true sentiments of Universalism, as strong as a man could. This I mean to show before I close.

Now what he says on the final restitution of all things is valuable. It shows, too, that he was a man of good sense and great learning. I now quote Acts iii, 21, and give Dr. Adam Clark's views on the passage: "Whom the heavens must receive, until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began." The question here is, what does this restitution of all things mean? And as Dr. Clark gives the true view of Universalists on this passage, I will make a few extracts from what he says on this point: *the time of the restitution of all things.* "The word *apokatastasis*" says he, "from *apo*, signifies from, and *Kathistanein*, to *establish*, or *settle* any thing, viz. in a *good state*; and when *apo* is added to it, then this preposition implies, that this *good state*, in which it is settled was preceded by a *bad one*, from which the change is made to a good one." \* \* \* \* \* Now (without reading all he says here,) he would have us understand, that this word *apokatastasis* being connected, as it is, with *which God hath spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets*, it must include the whole reign of grace, *restoring all things*, utterly destroying the *reign of sin*, and establishing the *good state*—a state in which man loves God with all his heart, soul, mind and strength, and his neighbor as himself. The conclusion of the whole is, taking the kingdom out of the hands of sin and satan, and putting it into the hands of righteousness and truth.

These, my friends, are the views of Dr. Adam Clark, almost learned and able commentator; and these are our views, and we believe they are the only views that are right.—[Time expired.]



## [MR. POWER'S EIGHTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators and Congregation:* I have no objection at all to my friends reading Dr. Clark, and shall only make two remarks on this subject. First, if he could show that Dr. Clark was a thorough universalist, that he he always had been, and had maintained it throughout his Commentaries, it would not touch the question. The place for appeal for testimony is the Old and New Testament. So his time is all lost in quoting from Dr. Clark.

My second remark is, some persons are very unskillful in handling edge tools. For the Doctor's comment proves any thing but universalism. He refers this passage to the spread of the gospel in this world. He speaks of the effect of embracing the gospel in the believer's soul, and supposes the promise is that by and by the gospel will be universally preached and universally received and produce its effect on every one, because every one shall receive it, and this too is to take place in this world—he does not make it have any reference to a state of immortality beyond the grave.

Would Dr. Clark teach that the gospel was to be preached and believed in heaven? Never! He only speaks of the triumphs of the gospel in this world. Who would ever suppose that we should witness the triumph and spread of the gospel in the future world? No one. So you see my friend has lost his time and his argument on this point. Dr. Clark is not so much of an universalist after all as my friend would claim him to be.

One remark further, lest Mr. D. should suppose I did not mean to attend to every thing he says—in reference to my supposed ignorance. I confess I do not know any too much. But this is not the subject in debate, and I must again beg the gentleman to notice that I must be excused from following him into personalities.

He, in referring again to the 20th Luke, did not meet the difficulties I placed in his way. Therefore, I will leave this till he meets my argument.

I will now again notice my friend's creed for a moment. He charges me with falsehood and slander for making the

statement I did respecting it. You recollect, my friends, his confession in trying to get around the point, when I called upon him to set me right, if I had not stated his system correctly. You recollect how he met the call, founded in justice, to me, to himself, to his system, and to this community. It was by retreating to this—that they did not declare such a doctrine publicly from the pulpit. But in his speech he said they did hold that men might commit all manner of crime, and even end their life by suicide, and then they may be saved. But did he mean that such might merely—that it was a bare possibility that such would be saved? He dare not take this ground. But still not satisfied with the position, he says the greatest sinner, even the chief of sinners, such as Paul, would be saved—the power of God was sufficient to change even his heart. And he endeavored to connect us in the same belief with himself. Now we believe that full provision is made for the salvation of the chief of sinners, and for all mankind, but this is not the question. The question is—is the salvation of man in heaven, wholly unconditional? And is it impossible for man by all his crimes, to prevent this salvation? He then gave this another turn, and I was not surprised; for I knew his great embarrassment. And although, he saw fit to be so very personal, I can overlook it all. But I cannot spare his system. He introduced his creed, to show, that he believed as much in the necessity of faith, repentance and love, in order to salvation and glory, as I did. Now do this congregation, understand this to be the fact? I think not. The serpent lies concealed under this covering, and I will try and pull it off, that you may all see his hideous form.

Mr. D. contends that his creed maintains that repentance, faith, and love to God and man, are essential to salvation. Now I ask, are they essential to salvation, in the future world, or in this world, or in both? Will he say that the system maintains the necessity of faith, love and holiness, here, in order to final salvation, and without these virtues here, there is no salvation in the future world? Will he say that his system maintains this? No,

he dare not. He knows it does not. Then the secret is out.—Thank you Mr. D., for giving me this hook. We have drawn your system out with it, and all now can see for themselves. It maintains *behind the curtain*, that there is no necessity whatever, for faith, or love, or holiness, in this life, in order to secure eternal life in heaven. It maintains, that a man may abjure all faith in the Bible, in Jesus Christ, in the existence of the Holy Ghost, in the being of God,—may perjure himself, may seduce the virtuous, may burn your house over your heads, may murder your children before your eyes, may commit robbery and theft, and every other crime, that can be committed,—the system we say, *behind the curtain*, maintains that a man may do all these things, and be as sure of heaven, by cutting his own throat, as if he were already there. And yet this system, *before the public*, will use smiles and soft words, and tell men they must repent, have faith in Jesus Christ, and love their fellow men, &c. &c.—using just enough, of the oil of Bible language, to make their machinery, run well through this world, and more certainly and speedily carry men down to destruction.

Now gentleman, the attempt was made this forenoon, to show, that I was not on the question, that I had made a new issue, I believe but few, if any, were affected by the effort. Mr. D. has maintained, as belonging to the first question, that man's salvation in a future world, was connected alone with the resurrection.

I now proceed to adduce counter proof, by showing that he is wholly incorrect in his premises. God connects man's salvation in heaven, with faith, holiness, and obedience in this life. This is no new question, that I am stating. It is the main question; and that too, without the advantages of the P. S. I referred to. I adduced in the forenoon, testimony from the word of God, showing that he that believeth in the Lord Jesus Christ, and obeys God in this life, hath everlasting life, and shall never perish. But that the wrath of God abideth, on all that do not believe and obey in this world, and dying in this state, will abide on them forever.

The argument I raise is, that these scriptures, impos-

ing moral duties on men in this life, teach that these are conditions of securing eternal life. While my friends argument is, that they teach nothing in reference to man's immortal destiny. I am to show that eternal life, is connected with faith and love &c., in this world. And here I remark again, and the gentleman has not touched the point—that eternal life, is the highest blessing, that God has promised to man. I stated, that there might not be any retreat, that eternal life was confined exclusively, to the present world, or exclusively to the future world, or it is begun here by faith, and purification of the heart; and by "enduring to the end," its possessor will enjoy it forever, in the future world. I showed if he takes the position, that eternal life is confined to this world, then there is no alternative, but to exclude it entirely from the future world, and no matter what he makes of the resurrection, none can be raised to eternal life. But he will not, take this ground, consequently he has no alternative on this point. Throughout the Bible, eternal life is promised to man alone, on condition of faith and holiness in this life.

Again, the wrath of God abideth on the unbeliever, and he who abides in his sins, cannot come where Christ is. Now how long can man abide, or continue in sin? It is evident they can continue in sin, through life and do. And that many remain so in death is equally plain. Now if the wrath of God abideth on all who are in their sins, and some live and *die* in their sins—must not such be miserable? And after his passage out of this life in his sins, can he believe and be saved? I answer no. There is no repentance after this life. And gospel faith, will be absolutely out of the question there. And yet it is said, "he that believeth not, the wrath of God abideth on him." Now I remark that so far as I show, that man's final destiny, is connected with faith, love and holiness, in this world, so far I take all the ground from the gentleman.

Again: to show that God has connected man's final destiny, his eternal salvation, with faith and obedience in this world, instead of having it depend entirely on the resurrection, I quote 1 Cor. vi. 9—11: "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not

deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."

Again, in proof of the same position, Gal. v. 19—21: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in times past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Again, Eph. v. 5, 6: "For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience." Finally, under this head, Rev. xxi, 8; "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death."

Now, gentlemen, my opponent has but one point at which he can retreat—that is, to deny that *the kingdom of God*, as used in these passages, has any reference to the future world. Well, if he take this position, it will not be difficult to show that there are hypocrites, and liars, and all kinds of evil persons, on earth—and such it is plain are shut out of the kingdom of God here,—they are not fit to be in the kingdom of God here, among the children of God. But we know that men have lived and died, gone into the future world possessing such a character, and as God has said that such shall not inherit the kingdom of God, and in as much as there can be no repentance or faith after death, it is still plain they must forever be shut out from the presence of God.

[Time expired.]

## [MR. DOOLITTLE'S NINTH SPEECH.]

I observe that our friend here, is getting somewhat engaged, he is waxing warm.—I admire his zeal, and only regret that it is not, exerted in a better cause—I have the impression, that he rests under the conviction that it requires of him the strongest efforts, both physical and mental, to defend his position; and did I stand in his position, I should feel as he does, so I am not surprised to see him make such desperate efforts. But I will say that all he has said, is foreign from the main argument, which I last brought forward. In reference to the “mountain,” in the passage from Isa. 25, he said nothing about it, and I fear will not, unless forced to it. He seemed to dwell on some things, in order to make capital out of them—to excite prejudice against our system—as if we had something awful and monstrous, concealed from the public view. But my friends, I hope you will keep cool and not be terrified. There is no Lion in the way, no terrible monster in ambush to pounce upon, and devour you.

I regret that my friend, should deal in statements, similar to what he has done before, saying that we teach, that men may go on in all crime, and cut their own throats and yet be as sure of heaven, as if they were already in heaven, and that we teach that all men will be saved, irrespective of moral character, [Mr. Power's here made a correction, that he said irrespective of moral character *in this world.*] Well I am thankful the gentleman has made the correction. He admits then that Universalists, do hold that men must have a good character in the future world, when they are saved. And I will now, ask the gentleman personally, if he expects to be saved in a future world, on the ground that he possesses a moral character, entirely free from all moral stain and pollution in this world. [Mr. Powers replied that he would answer, this or any other question directly, provided the favor would be reciprocated.] Well I should not like to pledge myself, to answer *every* question. For even a child may ask a question, a philosopher cannot answer. But I presume the gentlemen will not take the position, that he will

have eternal life, on the ground of his possessing a perfect moral character in this world. For the Scripture saith, "there is not a just man on earth, that doeth good and sinneth not," and "if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us." And I suppose that our good Presbyterian friends, hold that the most pious and holy christians, that can be found, have some imperfections here and need to be made more pure, before they are prepared for heaven, and I would ask the gentleman, if he leaves this world with some seeds, of moral pollution still remaining in him, if he does not expect some change to take place in his character, either at death or after death. And yet he is finding fault with me, because I hold that such a change must take place. What too, the best of divines have held, and they hold this on the authority of the Bible,—that a change for the better, must take place with every christian, either at death or after, before they are fit for heaven: because the best have some imperfections about them here, have the seeds of sin yet remaining in them. Now if we can be cleansed and changed, from this small amount of pollution (if we may so speak) why cannot God, whose power is unlimited, change even the vilest sinner who dies in his sin, and fit him for heaven.

Now, the gentleman accuses us of holding that even the pirate will be saved, even if he should commit suicide, and will by the great power and benevolence of God, be redeemed and saved evermore in the kingdom of immortality. Well, what is there terrible about this? And why should he attempt to raise a great bugbear about this to alarm you? My friends, does God change his disposition toward us, when we leave this world? I learn from my Bible, that the Lord changeth not, that he is the same yesterday, to-day and forever. Now if God's disposition remains the same eternally, cannot the Almighty communicate light, and knowledge, and truth, which shall sanctify, make holy and happy out of the body, as well as in this tenement of clay in this world? Now, in order for the gentleman to make any available argument from this, it will devolve on him to show that all who leave this

world without a knowledge of God, must suffer endless woe! And how many heathen fathers, mothers, husbands, wives and children, have lived and died, without even so much as ever hearing that there is a God or Savior? All these, if the gentleman's argument has any force, must be thrust down to a hopeless state of misery, in an endless hell; because they have not exercised faith in God, of whom they have never heard. Now I challenge the gentleman to put his finger on a passage of Scripture, that shows that because a man lives in this world in a state of unbelief in God, and leaves the world in the same state, that *he* is to remain so to all eternity. If he will do this, if he will produce one passage, for one plain passage, one thus saith the Lord is as good as ten thousand—I say, that if he will produce one declaration of God, that says that a man who dies in unbelief shall remain so to all eternity, I will yield up the whole ground at once and forever. But we know he is not able to do this.

Now what is there so awful in the idea that even a man who commits suicide, should by the mercy of God, be saved. My friends, would not we rejoice to know that such a vile, wicked person, was purified—that all his sins were forgiven? If we loved sinners as we ought, and as God loves them, I say would not we rejoice at such a glorious event as this? And would not my friend Power rejoice at it too? Yea, I know he would rejoice at it, we all would rejoice. All heaven would rejoice over this one sinner saved, more than over ninety and nine just persons, that needed no repentance. Now I see nothing awful, or anything to be frightened at in such an idea as this.

With respect to this "*everlasting life*," I said that everlasting life was the effect of faith on the believer—the spiritual life of the soul, and that it is enjoyed in the present tense. Do you not know, friends, that the gentleman believes that this everlasting life may be lost—that the believer, although he has it to day, may backslide tomorrow, and be damned to all eternity? Certainly, he holds this doctrine. But remember, he has taken the position, that this everlasting life is begun here, and would



continue till death and to all eternity; irrespective of moral character. [Mr. Power here corrected, and said his position was, this life would continue if the believer was faithful till death.] But remember if the believer backslides, he loses this life. And mark, this is something very different from *immortality*. Immortality to man is the gift of God, irrespective of what man can do in this world. When man dies, it is for God to say, whether he shall live again. His being raised from the dead depends on God alone. Hence, I believe the Apostle has reference to this immortality when he tells us, "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."—"It is not of works lest any man should boast. The gentleman tells us that "he that believeth has life, and he that believeth not the wrath of God abideth on him." How long does the wrath of God abide on him? As long as he remains in unbelief. If my friend can show me that unbelief will last forever, I will give up the point. A man may be an unbeliever to-day, and to-morrow be converted, and become a sincere believer. This the gentleman believes, as well as I. To sustain his position, he must show that the wrath of God will abide on the unbeliever to all eternity. If he *will* do this, I will give up. So you see it would be very easy for him to gain the day, if he only had the proof. But for want of the proof, when he comes near some of the strong arguments I have adduced, he contrives to slip around them. I have given him a number of arguments, and he has gone around them. [Power—What arguments?] The one in respect to the mountain, in Isa. 25th, and the promise contained there; and when you get through with that, let me hope you will not forget to examine this testimony, Rev. v. 11-13: "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beats, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousand of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." But this is not all, we come now to the universal redemption—"And every creature which

heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and the Lamb, forever and ever." Now here the universal redemption is taught, in language not to be misunderstood. The gentleman may say this includes fish, fowls, and all living creatures in this world; *he* may add it as far as *he* pleases, as far as Mr. Wesley or I—*he* may tell us it proves too much; but it proves *enough* to prove, in a restricted sense, viz. that all mortal rational intelligence will be redeemed. What the author means to teach most evidently is, that all the intelligent creation, all who have been redeemed from the dominion of sin, should here unite with one heart and voice praise the angels of heaven, and shout blessing, and honor, and glory and power to Him who had so accomplished and effected such a great and glorious enterprise, as the salvation of the whole world. There can be no doubt in an unbiased mind, that this includes every rational and intelligent being. Says Professor Stewart, "Stronger language could not be used to embrace the whole intelligent universe, than is here employed."—[*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S NINTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and the Audience*—The first I notice is the xxvth Chap. of Isaiah. I did not notice it in my last speech, because when passing it, it did not occur to me, that the gentleman had referred to it. I will remark again, that the prophet is here speaking of the political and religious condition of nations on earth—of the moral darkness that existed—of the spread of the Gospel—that by means of the Gospel, God would remove this veil, this moral darkness, that is spread over nations. My friend understands this as belonging to the heavenly world. Then all nations are there covered with sin. Well, if this is the case, if all the human race were included, according to the explanation of Mr. D., every individual is to go into the heavenly world in a state

of sin, under the veil of sin, and yet he dont admit that there is any misery there; and all these scenes, here described, are to be transacted in heaven, for there is no other place to go after death. And I only have to ask him to produce a single passage from the Bible, to show that there is a change from sin to holiness, to take place in the future world. If he will do this, I will give up my position, and turn Universalist preacher before I leave this village. Now I am just even with him in this proposition.

You observed that Mr. D. had to come out on the ground that holiness in *this life* was not indispensable to salvation. And mark, he has confirmed my statement, that his system gives license to all men to go on in all manner of crimes, and still be sure of heaven. He has given us quite an apology for the self-murderer. He cant see any thing very awful in a man's cutting his throat, nothing in it that can exclude him for a moment from heaven.

Now I am going to show you, on his system, that every man has the key of the kingdom of heaven in his own hands; and that he has only to turn this key, and he enters into heaven. When a man gets tired of this world, just let him cut his own throat, and he is sure of heaven. This then is the key, and every one has it. The key is easily turned, and the door to heaven is at once opened.

I would waive the point, whether I expect heaven on account of my own personal holiness; but I do not wish to pass any point he requests me to notice. I will say that I suppose no man will enter heaven without holiness, and I suppose the Apostle entertains the same idea, when he says: "Having these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." But when I get to heaven—which I expect through the grace of God—I have no doubt I shall give all the glory to God, for my salvation.

Mr. D. lost all the time he employed in trying to make out that I hold that a change must take place in death with every person, before he can enter heaven. His remarks on our Presbyterian brethren, appear to have been made to fill up the time, as they afford no support to his system. It matters not what others believe. We demand proof

from the Bible, that any such change takes place in death, or subsequent to death, in any case.

His next remark was not less inappropriate, the substance of which is: If God never changes, then it follows that all persons may be changed and brought to heaven—as God has announced his will that all men might be saved in this world—as God will not change his purpose, then all men will be saved, in this life. But is this the fact? Surely not. Now this is all based on an assumption, that God has willed to save all men, irrespective of their moral character in this life; which we deny in toto.

Again: he says, God can communicate power to change the soul after it leaves the body, as well as he can before. This is mere evasion. The question is not what God *can* do by his omnipotence, but what he *will* do, as a righteous, moral Governor. We deny that a passage can be found in the Bible, where it is said that provision is made for the change or salvation of any soul, that dies in his sins.

He says he will yield the point, if I give him a text, showing that a man would remain in unbelief in a future state. Here is one, John iii. 36: "He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." We know that multitudes die in unbelief. Now here it says, that the wrath of God abideth on those that believe not. I showed that gospel or saving faith, is impossible after death. In the future world, all is knowledge and sight. The very moment an individual passes beyond the bounds of time, this faith is impossible. And if one dies in unbelief, he must necessarily always remain in that state. This point then is established conclusively.

Mr. D. made a singular remark: "when a man dies it is for God to say whether he shall live again or not." This is another intimation of the true character of the system. Does he mean that the soul dies? It would seem that he questioned the immortality of the soul, notwithstanding his disclaimer.

I now turn to his quotation from Rev. v. 11—13. To show that my friend can derive no support from this passage, I will read the whole chapter:

“ 1. And I saw in the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the back side, sealed with seven seals.

2. And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof ?

3. And no man in heaven, nor in earth; neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon.

4. And I wept much, because no man was found worthy to open, and to read the book, neither to look thereon.

5. And one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof.

6. And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne, and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns, and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth.

7. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne.

8. And when he had taken the book, the four beasts, and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints.

9. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof : for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation ;

10. And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth.

11. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands;

12. Saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing.

13. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the

earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever.

14. And the four beats said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever."

Now mark, to have this avail him anything, all the scenes described here, must be referred to heaven; for remember, according to his system, there is no other place for us after death, no misery : while it is evident that much of it must refer to the progress of the Gospel in the earth. The revelator uses highly figurative language in his description, as is usual with the inspired writers, in predicting the spread of the Gospel in the earth. There is not a particle of Universalism to be found in this chapter, nor anything that can be tortured into this doctrine—that a man can go on in all manner of crimes through life, commit suicide at last, and then be sure of heaven.

I have now gone over all his arguments, and I will not detain the audience to fill up all my time, but make only a few more observations. Mr. D. staked his system in the outset, and relied for the support of his affirmative, on the doctrine of the resurrection. I showed that his interpretation of the xv. of 1 Cor., rejected Christ, made him only an ideal being, and must be false. I showed that Jesus Christ was not an ideal being, and, that there was no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved ; so that he could have no salvation, according to his interpretation.

I showed in the second place, that his main proof texts were wholly unavailable to him, or he denied the immortality of the soul. I called upon him to look this objection in the face; for if this resurrection had reference to the body only, the character and condition of the soul was left untouched, and if he took the soul into the account, then he must take the ground that the soul dies, that it is mortal, and puts on its immortality in the resurrection. These facts destroy his superstructure. And I adduced counter testimony from the word of God: first, from the

Gospel of John; where it is said, all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of man and come forth; they that have done good, to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation. We showed his absurdity, in attempting to avoid the force of this scripture, in that this resurrection, according to his explanation, leaves those who have done evil in precisely the same state they were in before; for they are raised to condemnation, and they were in a state of condemnation before. So this text stands still as immutable against his system, as the eternal throne. Then as an off-set to the difficulty he tried to start about idiots and infants, I quoted Rev. xx. 12, which he has never even noticed.

I now lastly state and then close, that the gentleman takes the ground that man's eternal destiny is connected alone with the resurrection; while I showed that it is connected with faith and obedience in this life, and has no necessary connection whatever with the resurrection.

---

THURSDAY, JULY 31—9 O'CLOCK, A. M.

---

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S TENTH SPEECH.]

It will be borne in mind, probably by the majority of those present, that the first argument I adduced to sustain my affirmative, was predicated on the resurrection to a state of immortality, incorruption, and glory, and holiness and happiness, in the immortal state of the whole creation of God. We held that the change effected at the time, would fit all for the enjoyment, of the presence of God forever—that it would mould the soul, into the very image, and likeness of Christ,—into the similitude of the God and Father of their spirits,—and result in the entire redemption from every impurity, and every evil, both physical and moral, and that this change, would deliver all from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God, would place them on an

equality in moral purity, with the Angels of God, because they would be made the children of God, being children of the resurrection, and not subject to death any more. This is the ground, on which we predicated our proof, mainly in support of the affirmation of the question in debate.

We consider this one of the strongest pillars, of the super-structure on which we lean, the eternal rock, in proof of the doctrine of the ultimate holiness and happiness, of the entire human race, in a state of immortality, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone. But Elder Power, joins issue with us here, and endeavors to impose on you the belief, that this change effects only the physical man, the body, and does not touch the condition of the soul. Now I want to show you definitely, that our friend is in error here, and that this change does affect the soul, as well as the body. For it is as susceptible of proof, that the soul is affected by this change, as it is that the body is affected by it. The very same proof, that shows a change in the physical condition, proves that a change is effected in the moral condition.

The proof is contained principally, in the 15th of 1 Cor. I want first to remind you, how far we travel together in this argument. We agree that Paul, here proves the resurrection of all men to immortality. Now the question arises, what will be the condition of all men when thus raised; will it be the same, that it is before death, or will it be a change both moral and physical, which will make all holy and consequently happy. Paul says, it makes a change from corruption to incorruption, from dishonor to glory, from an earthy image to a heavenly image, in fine an entire change from the bondage of corruption, to the glorious liberty of the children of God.

If we do not prove this, then we do not sustain our position, but if we adduce the proof, then you are bound to consent, that our position is true, and mark! We do not rest this matter on our assertion, but on the word of God. What is to be the result of this change? The Apostle here in speaking of this change, contrasts our present earthly corruptible and impure condition, with the heavenly immor-



tal and incorruptible state after the resurrection. He tells us the first man, the representative of our race was earthy. "The first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is the Lord from Heaven." And as is the earthy, such also are they that are earthy, and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly, and as we have borne the image of the earth, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now by the first man, is meant Adam, that is the representative of our race, in the earthly condition—he was clothed in the earthly constitution—the Adamic nature. Now Christ is declared, to be the head or representative of every man, in the heavenly constitution. Now as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Does not this imply a moral change? Paul draws the conclusion, that as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall *also* bear the image of the heavenly. Again, "For as in Adam all die, *even so* in Christ shall all be made alive." Now language more clear to establish my point, could not be found, than this to establish the point under consideration.

It is beyond the skill of man, to avoid the force of this language. But to proceed; says Paul, "Now this I say brethren, that flesh and blood, cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." Paul is here speaking about inheriting the future heavenly world, speaking of the change from mortality to immortality. Now nothing impure can gain admission into that state. But when raised up, as Paul has informed us, they shall be, they will be fit to enter in,—because all deformity and corruption, will be removed from them.

Again, "Behold I show you a mystery, we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed; in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." This change [mark,] is to pass on all, and all shall be changed, and all shall be raised. How raised, "and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." Now notwithstanding all this, our friend will tell you, there can be no moral change for the better after death. But if there is to be no change for the better, he, and all of us

may despair, of immortality in heaven. For as I said all, including the best of men, will have some impurity, sin and corruption, resting on them in this life till death. But we are not to be left in the state, our friend would have us left in, for mark, what a change is to pass on all,—“For this corruptible must put on incorruption; and this mortal must put on immortality.” Now when this shall be done —“then shall be brought to pass, the saying that is written; death is swallowed up in victory! O death where is thy sting! O grave where is thy victory.” Now I ask will there be any sinners there, on whom the sting of death, which is sin, will remain! No! to make this clear Paul adds, “the sting of death is sin” then all are represented as exclaiming, “Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ.” From this, it is as plain as language can make it, that the sting of death, sin, will all be removed by the resurrection. But still, we find he has the presumption, to come forward here and assert, that this change will not affect the condition of the soul. Now what does affect the soul! Does sin attach to the body or to the soul? Is the body held accountable, to the bar of God; or is the soul? These interrogations do not require an answer. But here is a redemption, spoken of from that which pollutes the soul, from all the effects of sin, from the sting of death, which we are told is sin. “The wages of sin is death; but here is a complete victory over death, and the song of victory, is sung in the highest strains of praise to God, for the great deliverance, and mark, all this glorious victory is achieved, through the resurrection, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Now my friends, I am willing to rest the whole argument, on this one position, which we have repeatedly taken, and which our friend has as often undertaken to remove. He might as well undertake to shake the pillars of the universe.

But I want to give you still more, for I know such is the strength of the old prejudices, to the contrary, on account of wrong training from childhood, that it is necessary to give precept upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line, here a little, and there a little, in or-

der to bring you to see the truth, as it is on this important subject. many have rallied around, and pledged themselves to support a creed, that teaches a very different doctrine, and I know it requires, great moral courage to face prejudice, and abandon a banner, under which they have fought, and around which, so many still cluster. If it had not been for this, as I said before, my friend here would have been converted before this time. And as I said, he must sin against much light. For I believe, he understands very well the principles of the Universalists. He holds that a man may continue to resist the spirit, and be damned. But I have a more cheerful hope for my friend, and believe that he will yet bear a glorious part, in that song that shall go up to God, in seraphic strains, shouting victory over sin, death and the grave, and every foe, both to God and man. But as I said, I want to give you line upon line, precept upon precept, and I now invite your attention to the 25th of Isa., again to the glorious promise, relative to the final consummation. Our friend has labored to confine this, to this world. But did not I tell you, that Paul in speaking of this state, in connection with the resurrection, says when that shall have been effected, "then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory, O death! where is thy sting—O grave! where is thy victory." And did I not tell you, that this saying is written but once in the Bible, and that too in this place, which our friend Power limits to this world. But does Paul limit this, to this world? Elder Power and Paul, are evidently in opposition,—If the Elder understands it right, then Paul understands it wrong. Now which shall we believe—this is an important question. To err is human, and I would say, let God be true though every man be found a liar.

Now mark, our friend says this mountain, is a mountain in Judea, in this world, [Mr. Power here interrupted, and said he did not say, it was a literal mountain in this world, but according to Mr. Doolittle's interpretation, this mountain and scenes connected with it were in heaven.] The interpretation I gave it was, that it was a figure for the kingdom of God's holiness,—the gospel kingdom.—

it is to be done in it? A feast is to be prepared. This reference to the provisions of divine grace, in the kingdom.—What is next to be done? God will de-  
 the face of the covering cast over all people, and  
 ail that is spread over all nations. Here it is taught  
 God will cause an entire change, both moral and phys-  
 o take place on *all people*. Of course *all people* and  
*nations*, include the whole human family, for where  
 you find people, after you have got *all people*. Then  
 s, “He will swallow up death in victory, and the  
 God will wipe away tears from all faces.” What  
 s tears and death? Sin—sin is the cause of death.  
 here, not only the cause will be removed, but all the  
 s. Well Paul quotes this, showing that it reaches for-  
 beyond the grave. At the final consummation of all  
 s, at the resurrection, then shall be brought to pass  
 ying that is written. Death is swallowed up in vic-  
 and this saying is written in the 25th of Isa. Con-  
 ntly this must refer to the future state.  
 d this I say, is the conclusion of the matter, the final  
 mation, the winding up of the great scheme of Uni-  
 l Redemption. This is proved to be the final consu-  
 on, from what Paul says. “Then cometh the end,  
 he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even  
 after when he shall have put down all rule, and all  
 rity and power. For he must reign, till he hath put  
 emies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be  
 oyed is death”. What does this mean, “till he hath  
 ll enemies under his feet, and the last enemy that  
 be destroyed is death.” Is there any enemy after  
 ist enemy? But this last enemy shall be destroyed.  
 this end, results in the exemption of the whole hu-  
 family from sin, and from all the effects of sin, and  
 stain the affirmative of the question.—[*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S TENTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and the Audience*—We have been  
 y favored this morning, with about the 9th edition of  
 entleman's proof, without either a new chapter or verse.

But there is one point that he has made more definite, by endorsing what we stated in the out-set to this audience, viz. that the doctrine of the resurrection merely, as set forth in the xvth of 1 Cor., is the strongest ground which the system which I oppose can occupy.

To refute this, I need only repeat my reply, as already given. But as the gentleman has been a little more minute than before, I will bestow some further attention to it. Although there was a little complaining last evening, in a friendly way, that I had attributed to my friend what he did not say, he has relieved me this morning. I charged him with denying, as a consequence his interpretation of this scripture relative to the resurrection, the personality of the Savior. He has now made this clear. Adam, he says, in the text, represents the earthly constitution, and Christ the heavenly constitution. So I am relieved here, of the charge of misrepresenting him.

I have now only to remind you that this position, this strongest proof in the Bible, of his system, is in direct opposition to the universal doctrine of the sacred Scriptures. For the Bible holds, that Christ is a literal, absolute, personal, intelligent being; God manifest in the flesh, and the only name given under heaven whereby we must be saved. The question under debate, is to be sustained, if at all, from the Scriptures. And you see, that the only ground on which he rests his proof, is in direct opposition to God's Word.

Mr. D. took great care not to advert to my former refutation of his position, viz: to sustain his ground by any appearance of proof, he must deny the immortality of the soul. But as he could not deny this, all his effort this morning is perfectly lost. It leaves the soul wholly unprovided for. As observed before, you see a good night's rest gives Mr. D. a very good first speech. But with all the improved strength, together with all the helps from other sources, he saw fit to pass this difficulty without a solitary remark. And his principal effort to sustain his position was made on the following declaration: "Now this I say brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."

Now here is sophistry. For you will observe, the Apostle here is saying nothing about moral corruption, as our friend would have us suppose, for the sake of assisting his argument. But he says, *flesh and blood* cannot inherit the kingdom of God. Now as this is the fact, Paul tells us what is to be done: "Behold I show ~~you~~ a mystery, We shall not all sleep, [die,] but we shall all be changed." What shall be changed? The soul? No; he is not speaking of the soul, but of the body. Some, instead of dying in the common way, shall have their bodies instantly changed. The body shall put on immortality or an undying constitution, in the resurrection. In the *premises*, Paul says not one word about the *soul*, for the soul is not mortal or subject to death; and nothing but sophistry would bring the soul into the conclusion.

We leave this intelligent audience to locate the sophistry that is brought to bear in this question. Every person acquainted with the first principles of Logic, knows that it perfectly vitiates an argument to bring more into the conclusion, than is contained in the premises. But Mr. D. slyly slips the *soul* into the conclusion, while it is not to be found in the premises.

Now with the veil taken off, (and the gentleman, as is seen by his frequent reference to the 25th of Isaiah, attaches great importance to taking off the covering,) we see how he arrives at the conclusion, that all shall be made holy and happy in the resurrection.

Again: who are the enemies spoken of, that shall be put under Christ's feet and destroyed? The Bible decides, that the carnal mind is enmity against God—and that sinners dying in their sins are the enemies of God. Now, if the destruction of all the enemies of God means that they are taken to heaven, then death and all these are to be taken to heaven, for they are to be destroyed. This is the strength of Mr. D.'s proof: he maintains, that to be put under the feet of the Savior, is equivalent to being taken to heaven. But is this the Bible view? No. But to be put under feet, means degradation and death. Take a case. When the five kings of the Amorites, to escape Joshua's army took shelter in the cave; when discovered, they

were brought out, and the captains were commanded to put their feet on their necks, not as a token of their salvation, but as indicative of the degrading death they were consigned to. This is the Bible use of this expression, and it cannot be changed to accommodate the gentleman. He would be very glad to have it mean salvation. But even if it should, there would still be an insuperable difficulty; for then it would follow, that *death* would be taken to heaven, and be eternally safe with God. Now this is the strong proof of the gentleman, on which he invites you to stake your eternal interests.

We again notice Isaiah xxv. I have showed you that the scenes here described, belong to this world—the great absurdity of fixing them in heaven. My friend tries to prove their reference to the immortal state, by Paul's use of it. Now all know that the Apostles do refer to the Old Testament frequently, and apply it in an accommodated sense; so Paul may be understood in this passage. You will observe that the theme of the prophet is, a moral victory; and the Apostle uses it, because it aptly expresses the work achieved for the body in the resurrection.

In regard to the mountain, we perceive Mr. D. saw his difficulty. He first made it the mountain of God's holiness, and then the mountain of the Gospel kingdom. Does the Gospel extend into the future world? Does its work belong to the future world to warn men to forsake their sins, to cease to blaspheme, repent, reform, and use the sacraments and means of grace? I ask, does the Gospel do this in the future world? He would not dare to assume that all this belongs to heaven; and yet, unless he does, his Gospel Kingdom avails him nothing, for that is confined to this world. Then he must come back to his mountain of God's holiness. Then all the nations of the world have to go into the mountain of God's holiness, in the future world, with their ignorance and darkness, and blasphemy, and the veil, meaning all moral pollution, spread over them. And into this mountain, Moab, with all his sins and corruption, is to enter in the eternal world, and is there to be trodden down as straw is trodden down for the dung-hill. Now let the gentleman meet this difficulty if he pleases.

Mr. D. has staked every thing on the resurrection of the body. This is the main and almost only support of his system. I have shown on the authority of the Holy Scriptures, which he has not even noticed, that God has connected man's future destiny with faith and obedience in this life, and without these he cannot be saved. You see plainly, if the system of Universalism gets any support at all from the argument of the resurrection, it is on the ground that through the resurrection *alone* men are changed, and made new creatures in Christ—made holy and fit for heaven. We now proceed to show that *morally* to be in Christ, and be fitted for heaven, has no necessary connection with the resurrection—that God has fixed salvation on other conditions entirely than the resurrection, and that unless these conditions are fulfilled on the part of man, he is raised to a resurrection of damnation. We quote from 2nd Cor. v. 5, 6: "Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord; for we walk by faith, not by sight." "Hath wrought us," mark; not in the resurrection, but in this world a moral change is wrought in the soul, and without this being done, there can be only a resurrection to damnation. And mark, *faith* is inseparably connected with the salvation of the soul; and I have shown you, that there is no place for faith in the future world. "Wherefore if any man be in Christ he is a new creature." How? Why as explained before, by faith in Jesus Christ. Gal. v. 6: "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." The resurrection of the body depends alone on the will of Jesus Christ; while the change to be effected in the soul, the moral change, in order to fit it for heaven, is conditioned on faith; and faith takes place only in this world.—[Time expired.]



## [MR. DOOLITTLE'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.]

Our friend seems to think that our comfortable night's rest is a great help to me in making out an argument. I wish I could say the same of him. But I should think in listening to his argument just brought forward, that he has been but little benefitted by a night's rest. I could have saved him from much of his labor, but chose to defer it till I arose.

I will now refer him to one point once more. For he has endeavored to throw dust in your eyes, on the argument from the resurrection. This he has endeavored to do, relative to the person of Christ and his agency in man's salvation. He says the position I occupy, denies the personal agency of Christ in man's salvation, and in the resurrection. This is a very strange idea for him to advance. I supposed I had explained this so clearly, that he would see it, and we should hear no more about the matter. I told you that the resurrection was effected through the personal agency of Jesus Christ—that the great change which would place the whole human family in a state of immortality, incorruption, holiness and happiness, make them equal unto the angels, and not subject to death any more—that this change was effected through the agency of Jesus Christ. And yet, my friend comes up and says I throw the Savior out of the account altogether. We most fully recognize Christ as the redeemer and Savior of the world, and believe that God hath clothed him with his own authority, and endowed him with power and might without measure, in order that he might accomplish this work. We believe he will redeem man from every species of corruption. Hence, says Paul, and so say we too, "Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." Now I hope the gentleman will not get up again and say we deny the agency of Christ in man's redemption, for to make it clear I was explicit on this point; but I presume, for I wish to be charitable, that owing to the fog before his eyes, my friend did not see it.

Again: he says my views of the resurrection leads me

to deny the immortality of the soul. Well, this is merely an assertion, without any proof. It is not necessary that I should go over the ground again minutely, and adduce passages to prove conclusively to every unprejudiced mind, that the change effected by the resurrection, is a moral, as well as a physical change. I showed, and my friend will not deny, that the best of christians have some moral pollution about them, till the close of life, and that there must be some change for the better at, or after death, or else we may all despair of holiness and happiness in heaven. Because nothing can enter there, that has the least moral deformity. But *here*, we say, all have some seeds of moral pollution remaining. How are these to be removed? We say, by the resurrection change.

Now I want to ask my friend one question. As every individual is to be raised up in the resurrection, and as we agree that all will possess immortal, incorruptible bodies, I ask—Do you believe that a sinful and polluted soul, in the resurrection will be joined with an incorruptible and perfect body? [Power—Yes I do. The body till it is united with the soul, has no moral character about it whatever, but derives all its moral character from the soul.] Well, now we may go home, for he has conceded all we wish. He has conceded that the body receives its moral character from the soul. And we have proved, which he does not deny, that all will be raised up with pure incorruptible, immortal bodies, and as they receive their character from the soul, it must follow that every soul in the resurrection is pure and incorruptible. The gentleman has conceded this unfortunately for him, for it demolishes his whole theory and as I said, we may as well go home in peace rejoicing in hope of the glory of God, in the final and complete redemption of the whole human race from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

But in order that our friend may not lose sight of this, and lest it should not result in his conversion, I will employ a few moments more in making the subject a little more lucid. He admits that the soul and body are to be united, and has conceded that the body receives its moral character from the soul. We likewise agree that all bodies

will be raised incorruptible. Now I want no stronger argument than this in support of the final and entire redemption of all intelligent beings to immortal happiness. And do believe that my friend is struck under conviction by the truth of the Apostle, and I do hope he will yield to the full conviction and we shall all be brought home to glory in the full belief of this glorious doctrine; my friend will rejoice there if he does not here. Now I am afraid that the mountain in labor in my friend's mind, will not produce the proper fruit I will enquire here if the angels in heaven have impure souls. And mark, the Savior says, "all who obtain that state are equal to the angels and become children of God, being children of the resurrection." Now if all are equal to the angels, they must resemble them likewise in moral character must be pure as the angels. It is plain, the redemption, will be complete. Paul informs us it will be a victory over the last enemy, Death. What constitutes death? Let us look at this, for I want you to see the whole of it. Death is an effect. Now the removal of an effect supposes no longer the existence of the cause of that effect. It is a sound principle in philosophy that cause and effect are inseparably connected, and when the cause is removed, the effect must cease, and the removal of the effect, argues the removal of the cause. All will admit this. Now I say this moral death is the effect of a cause. "The wages of sin is death." Carnal mindedness is the cause here, and its effect is death. But remember that death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed, death the effect is destroyed, and when the effect ceases, the cause is removed. The effect being removed, necessarily proves the removal of carnal mindedness, the cause. When death no longer exists, it necessarily follows that men will not then be carnally minded. So let us all rejoice in hope of this glorious change.

Again, my friend finds some fault with me about the Gospel Kingdom, and here he misrepresented me probably not designedly however, but because he sometimes forgets or does not hear well. I said the term *mountain* was used as a figure to denote the Gospel Kingdom, and that those provisions for the feast were the provisions of divine grace

and mercy. He says the Gospel is not going to extend into the future world—that preaching and all the Gospel privileges that men have, are to be enjoyed only in this world. But what is the fact in the case? The God of heaven set up this Gospel Kingdom, and Christ is the head of it. He received it from his Father. How long is it to continue, and how long before Christ shall deliver up the Kingdom to God, from whom he received it? Why, “he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet”—till every enemy is subdued and all men are raised in glory and honor, and are clothed with incorruption and eternal life. Then cometh the end of his reign—the end of the Gospel Kingdom. Then he will deliver up the kingdom of God the Father, and become himself subject to him that put all things under him that God may be all in all, i. e. that throughout the vast universe of mind, God may be the reigning power, the living principle, and all souls be moulded into the likeness and image of God. All this is to be effected when the Gospel Kingdom is given up. For this is the last crowning act of redeeming love, that which winds up the administration of God by the agency of Jesus Christ. This completes the whole temple and the head stone is brought forth with shoutings, crying grace, grace unto it. And every man as a lively stone is redeemed clothed with glory and power and immortality, and occupies his place in the building. And this building is the admiration of the whole universe. All will have there, their final home, and all will then unite in singing praises to God, as described in Rev. 5th, which our friend noticed last evening, up to the last four verses, which I quoted, and left there, and stated the chapter had reference to scenes in this world. But I will notice it again, and you will see what reference it has. The Revelator tells us he was in the spirit on the Lord’s day, and God revealed to him what should take place hereafter. The revelator was made acquainted with reference to the whole progress of the Savior’s mission, 9th verse “and they sung a new song saying thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred and tongue, and

people, and nation and hast made us unto our God kings, and priests, and we shall reign on the earth." But this is not all. "And I beheld and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. But this is not all yet, now mark, what is said farther, "and every creature which is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them heard I saying, blessing and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lord forever and ever."

Now my friends it is impossible to restrict this language, and I told you we had Professor Stewart's authority for saying if this does not include the whole intelligent creation, then no language can include the whole; and for proof that all will unite in heaven in praising God, as here described, I cannot ask for stronger testimony than this I have already presented to you.—[*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S ELEVENTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen, Moderators, and the Audience*—The first item I shall attend to, is to correct an erroneous impression under which my worthy opponent appears to be laboring. He has charged me several times with being hypocritical, of laboring under conviction of the truth of his position, and had not moral honesty enough to confess it. Now to relieve his mind on this point, I will say that so far from being convinced of the truth of Universalism, every discussion I hold, only more fully convinces me of the great and dangerous errors of the system. One thing that strengthens this belief, is the writhing of my Universalist friends whenever I attempt to present the system in its true character. When I take hold of its real infidelity, and show that it fosters in its heart all the forms of the worst infidelity, they are all thrown into a panic. They feel that they are driven into a corner, and would almost

as soon be brought to judgment, as to see their real system thus brought out. Now, if they were convinced of the truth of their system, they would love to see it fully exhibited to the public. Hence so far from being convicted of its truth, I always feel that I am doing my Master's work, in divesting this system of its covering, and showing its dangerous errors.

And I announce this to the gentleman, that he may spend no more time in so useless a manner. For if I were going into the eternal world to-day, and had my family around my dying bed, the last warning I would give my children would be—shun Universalism, as the worst form of infidelity in God's universe.

Again: if I were the hypocrite that he charges me to be, why, I am now in hell. But his system puts the key of heaven and hell into the hand of the sinner, and he can leave the latter and go to heaven just when he pleases. It is at my option, whether I stay in this hell or go to heaven. And again, if I were all the corrupt character he has represented me to be, according to his system, I am going to heaven just as fast and surely as if I were as holy as John or Paul. So the gentleman need give himself no more trouble about my hypocrisy.

In regard to the second item we remark, not with a view to excite a smile, the old adage was forced upon my mind, that, "a drowning man will catch at straws." For though Mr. D. had not the moral courage yesterday, to lay himself under obligation to answer any question directly, yet he has put questions to me to be answered directly, and I have answered. And he thought he had found a straw and caught it, and proposed that the discussion should close. He is welcome to all the capital he can make of this. All his supposed advantage arises from not understanding me. My answer was, that neither in this, nor in the future world, had the body separate and apart from the soul, a particle of *moral* purity or holiness. Now I ask him to look at this distinctly, and see if he dare controvert the point. Will any one assert that the body, separate from the soul, has a *moral* character of any kind? Moral character is inseparably connected with

mind. The body in this, or in the future world, has no intelligence, and must be destitute of moral character.

This being the fact, then all the *moral* character the body has in this or in the future world, is relative. By itself, the body can have no moral purity or impurity. If the body is connected with a corrupt soul, in a relative sense, we may say the body is impure, whether in this world or in the future world. So if it be connected with a pure spirit, we may speak of it as being pure in this relative sense. Let the body be immortal in the resurrection, and indestructible, not subject to corruption or decay, or dissolution, then it receives its relative character from the soul, and eternally keeps the same character, whether holy or unholy. Hence, we refer you to the declaration of the Savior, that in the resurrection they that have done good come forth to the resurrection of life, and those that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation—the body receiving its relative character from the character of the soul. Now let the gentleman make all the capital he can out of the answer I gave to his questions. He maintained that the body, when raised from the dead, is pure and holy. We assert that the body, separate from the soul, has no moral character or intelligence at all.

Mr. D. animadverted on the subject of the kingdom again, and charged me with not taking down his remarks correctly. This charge was unfounded. He did represent it as the mountain of God's holiness, and then he changed it to the Gospel kingdom. He then undertook to show that this kingdom continued till Christ delivered up all to his Father, at the final consummation of all things. But this did not get over the difficulty of carrying the Gospel beyond this life,

What belongs to the Gospel kingdom? The preaching of the Gospel of course. Then are ministers to go forth in the future world, and proclaim salvation to sinners? The system that would maintain this, might be an object of contempt, but not worthy an argument to show its absurdity.

Mr. D.'s old stereotyped point was brought up once more—that the resurrection had reference to the moral

condition of men. But in regard to this argument of the resurrection, I have only to remind him of the point he has so often shunned. For, until he removes this difficulty, whatever turn he may give the argument, it will not avail him anything. For if he applies the doctrine of the resurrection to the soul, he must deny its immortality. There is no possibility of getting around this. If he says this mortal must put on immortality, includes the soul, the soul must be mortal. But if he takes this ground, that the soul is mortal, he must contradict his former position. We showed you that the system is bleeding at this point; and unless he takes the position of the mortality of the soul, it must bleed and die. But if he does take this ground, we are prepared to show that death awaits it there.

He charges me with misstating his views respecting the character of Jesus Christ, and then defines his true position. It is this : the resurrection will be effected by the mighty power of God, by the agency of Jesus Christ; and this power is delegated by God to Christ in this work. [Mr. Doolittle accepted this as a correct statement of his views, though including a part of two statements.] Here he virtually abandons his former position relative to the constitutional Adam and the constitutional Christ. But I will not call him back, for I gave him liberty to change his position if he chose. But his second ground is more hopeless for him than the first. For I have shown, that his first position is diametrically opposed to the Scriptures, and must be false. Now he endorses the fact, and takes another position more palpably in opposition to the Bible, as I shall show. He says all moral stains of every kind will be wiped away by the resurrection. I have only to cite a declaration or two from the Word of God, to show that the gentleman and the Bible are at direct issue. "By grace are ye saved through faith." "Except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Now, says Mr. D. it is not by grace through faith that we are saved, but by the omnipotent power of God, delegated to Christ, and put forth in the resurrection, that all are saved. Here then you see his system is directly



opposed to the whole plan of salvation, as revealed in the Bible.

Again: According to the Bible, Christ is the agent in raising the dead. This he admits. But unfortunately for his system, according to my friend, Christ has to raise the dead by a delegated power. The gentleman uses the term *delegated*, and he cannot change his position without discarding his whole argument. So Christ is only an agent in raising the dead. Now it is clear to a demonstration, that nothing short of omnipotent power can effect the resurrection of the dead. But Jesus Christ, according to Universalism, does not possess absolute, omnipotent power; then, of course, he must receive this power from another source, or he cannot accomplish the resurrection of the dead. But it is absolutely impossible, for one being to delegate to another absolute omnipotence, and still possess it himself. But as nothing short of omnipotent power can effect the resurrection of the dead, and as Christ raises the dead by delegated power, he must receive this omnipotence from God; and hence, God must change from omnipotence to impotence, and be destitute of power. So we are involved by the system in absolute Atheism! So you see the gentleman to avoid one difficulty, has plunged himself into a much greater one.

Again: "Have the angels impure souls?" asks the gentleman. I have before stated, on this point, that the question of moral character was not started by the Sadducees. But in answer to their materialism, Christ told them, that in the resurrection they neither married nor were given in marriage, but were equal to the angels; but moral character was not spoken of.

According to Mr. D.'s interpretation, being children of God in any sense, would be to possess moral purity. To show this is not the case, I quote Is. i. 2: "Hear O heavens; and give ear O earth, for the Lord hath spoken; I have nourished and brought up children and they have rebelled against me." Here are persons recognized as the children of God, but are they represented as pure or holy on that ground? No. So in the case referred to, being children of God does not imply that they were morally

pure or holy; and this was not what the Savior was speaking of at the time.—[*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S TWELVETH SPEECH.]

I feel most deeply to sympathise with our friend, since he has had to wield so much power as he did the last time up. But it is owing to the badness of the cause he has to maintain. The ingenuity he manifested, to avoid the force of my argument, reminds me of a certain sign, "*All kinds of twisting and turning done here.*" I think it would be well for him to carry this sign about with him; for he has manifested so much of a disposition to work at such business, that it would be a very appropriate sign for him. But all of his twisting and turning does not get him out of the difficulty. As I said before, many men by their ingenuity, can prove much as *they* suppose from the Bible; but one thing never can be proved, that is—the endless misery of any portion of the human race.

Our friend says he is determined to take hold of the vital parts of our system—to make a deadly thrust. Well, if the vital parts are vulnerable, and susceptible of destruction, I am willing he should attack and destroy the whole. He says we fear this as we would the judgment—as though all our hopes were going to be wrecked, and all our prospects cut off through his agency. But I find my hand very steady in noting down his argument, I have no sense of fear or trembling.

[Here Mr. Doolittle referred again to the answer Mr. Power gave to his question, and stated the answer to be, that a polluted soul would not be united to a pure body; evidently having misunderstood the answer. He was so confident, however, of being right, that when corrected by his opponent, he thought it was only an effort to back off from the difficulty. Considerable time was taken up in settling the point, which being referred to the Judges, was decided in favor of Mr. Power. The time being so far spent, the remainder of the speech was adjourned till afternoon; at which time, Mr. Doolittle spent a few minutes in stating again that he was sure of being right, &c. and proceeded with his speech."]

We feel under obligation to call your attention once more briefly to the resurrection state, to the condition of all men in a state of immortal existence. The question under discussion remember has reference to the condition of man in a state of immortality—it has reference to the condition of the entire human race, every moral being and hence I have laid hold of the powerful and conclusive argument of the Apostle as laid down in 1 Cor. xvth. chap. relative to the condition of all men in the immortal state of existence, in proof of the affirmative of the question, to prove that all will be holy and happy in that state. And the reason why I have come to the conclusion that all will be holy and happy there, is from the fact that the Apostle as we have shown, proves conclusively the great end of the Gospel—that all men by the power of God, through the agency of Jesus Christ the redeemer of mankind, the Savior of the world, will be raised to an immortal state of existence—clothed with power and glory, and honor, and placed on an equality, as the Savior has said, with the angels which will make them equal to the angels in their moral condition—constitute them children of God, as said the Savior, “being children of the resurrection,” and they shall not be subject to death any more.

Now mark, our friend tells us that this change effects only the body, and does not make the soul any better or purer. He admits that soul and body are united in the resurrection. If this be so, then when the Savior says “in the resurrection, they shall be equal to the angels,” he must include the soul as well as the body. It would make nonsense for him to say their bodies shall be equal to the angels. And how could he say a polluted, sinful soul was equal to the angels, or a polluted soul united with a pure body, was equal to an angels? To say that persons are raised in honor, and power, and glory, and are equal to the angels and become the children of God, does not this imply a connection of soul and body, and a moral relation too? Does the mere body without a soul constitute a child of God? Soul and body cannot be separated in this connection. Now to be raised in honor, glory, and incorruption, and become equal to the angels, and be the

children of God, is the condition of all men in an immortal state of existence, and if this fact does not sustain the affirmative of the question, there is no argument that can be adduced to sustain any position. But strange to relate our friend here still persists in trying to fasten the conviction that this change only effects the physical constitution, and has nothing to do with the moral state of the soul. Now to show you that he is mistaken and that I am right, hear what Paul says. "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory?" What is it that exclaims this, is it a mere lump of matter, a mere body and not the soul that makes this exclamation? Mark my friend holds that this change only effects the body. What a body that must be, that without a soul makes such an exclamation! Nonsense! It is the redeemed soul that makes this exclamation. And what a glorious victory and salvation this will be. We shall all then exclaim in triumph. O death where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory? On what ground is this victory to be predicated? It is to be proclaimed on the ground that the soul is redeemed from the bondage of sin and corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God, and is become equal to the angels. This certainly is a change that effects the soul. What more does any one want than this? I want no more. To be made equal to the angels, and shout the praises of God around his throne is all I ask or desire, and this is what is attained by all in the resurrection.

Again, here is another argument which shows that this change effects all men. This I said was a crowning work that winds up the great scheme of redemption, and so thought Paul. "Then" he says "cometh the end." What end? The end of Christ's administration here, when he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied. When the last wandering prodigal shall come home to his father's house. Then he shall deliver up the Kingdom to his Father. Now what constitutes the Kingdom which the

Son shall deliver up to the Father? Does it consist of a great mass of physical bodies without any souls? By no means. But this is the ludicrous position which our friend takes.

Again: Christ must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet, what does this mean, till he hath put down all the bodies. No, putting all enemies under his feet is synonymous with the destruction of all his foes. The last enemy shall be destroyed—it means the destruction or annihilation of every thing evil to man, or offensive to God.

The Apostle informs us in Hebrews ii. 14 that Christ will destroy him that hath the power of death *i. e.* the Devil. "He that committeth sin" says John "is of the Devil, for the Devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifest, that he might destroy the works of the Devil."

This destruction then, is a destruction that takes away all that offends, every thing that pollutes the soul, or destroys the power of the soul. It includes all physical suffering and moral evil.

It would seem that Paul meant to make out an argument, on this point as clear as light, and as definite as language could make it. But this light has not reached Elder Power yet. Still, I know it will reach him sooner or later. Paul, lest we might suppose an enemy of some kind would be left, adds, "The last enemy shall be destroyed, death. [Time expired.]

[MR. POWER'S TWELVETH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and the Audience*—A few general remarks on our friend's last speech, both before and since adjournment, and then we proceed.

First, his remark in reference to the mechanic's sign; I leave the decision to this intelligent audience, at whose door this sign stands out in bold relief. Let them decide. One remark on the disputed point. In this case I ask no favor. I claim only what is a universally conceded principle—that a speaker has a right to explain what he has said in debate. And this is the first instance that I have

known, of an explanation being controverted or rejected.

But now to his last speech. It is but a repetition of what he has told us in part or in whole, in every speech but the first since the commencement. But he has stated distinctly, if the xvth Chap. of 1st Cor. does not sustain his system, there is no other evidence that can. But he enquires whether a mass of physical bodies could exclaim, O death, where is thy sting! O grave, where is thy victory! On this supposed new light I have only to remark, that the Apostle has not stated that this will be the language of all in the resurrection state. This is the language Paul uses in view of the promise of God; and adds, thanks be to God who giveth us [himself and his brethren] the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. So the difficulty he has started here, is all imaginary.

Again, in regard to the *children of God* and the *Angels*, a word; for I do not mean to repeat all my argument again. We showed that an argument is absolutely false and delusive, that brings more into the conclusion, than is contained in the premises. And I called upon Mr. D., to show that the moral condition of the soul, was the subject of the enquiry which the Sadducees made of the Redeemer. But he has not attempted it; and if he were to attempt it, the letter of the text would contradict him at the threshold. For the question was one of relative condition—whether the marriage state would be the same in the future world that it is in this. Now while only the *relative* condition of men is spoken of in the premises, it is unpardonable sophism, to bring the *moral* condition into the conclusion. Then all that can save his argument, is to assume that to be a child of God in any sense, is to be holy and happy. But we quoted from the 1st of Isaiah, and showed you that some, called the children of God, were neither holy nor happy.

Again: the difficulty which we introduced—a difficulty too, which wholly destroys all his proof from the resurrection, in regard to which he says, if it (the resurrection) does not prove his point nothing can—has not been removed or touched. We say, to avail himself of any proof here, he must take the ground that the soul is mortal.

The Word says, "this mortal must put on immortality." And if it means this mortal soul must put on immortality in the resurrection, then the soul is mortal. But he has not availed himself of the privilege of claiming the mortality of the soul. I knew he would not dare to do it. I have apprised the congregation of his position here a number of times, following up his repetition, and still he has not touched this point. And now I challenge him again, (always using the term respectfully.) And I would remind you, too, of his circumstances; for I am not meeting him alone, but a little colony of his ministerial brethren with him here, on my right. But I do not complain at all at this, for I am willing to meet a ten-acre field of them; but I challenge him to look this difficulty in the face. He must apply this doctrine of the resurrection to the soul, or he must not. If he does not apply it to the soul, then his proof falls into utter and hopeless ruin; and if he does apply it to the soul, then he must maintain the *mortality* of the soul. And if he takes this ground, then he will have the unenviable distinction of this grand achievement before this intelligent audience, of placing us all on the honorable level with the ox and the ass, perfectly destitute of an immortal soul! We challenge the gentleman to come up and meet this difficulty. And we would request the audience to look at the signs over our doors, and observe where the twisting and turning is done.

Now, gentlemen, with the facts before you—that my friend has not adduced one solitary fragment of proof to bear on the condition of the soul—that he is in the dilemma I have named, I ask you to look farther, and see that he has placed the resurrection of the body in the hands of a finite being—and if he raises the body it must be by finite power—or if the difficulty is removed, God the Father must delegate his omnipotence to the Son, and then he must cease to be Almighty, and consequently no longer be God. So you see that this system, instead of being a system of universal salvation, is a system that places the final condition of both soul and body in the hands of finite weakness, and leaves all without hope and without God in the world. Now, as disproof of this unscriptural system, I bring up

the points already specified—that man's future and endless condition is connected with a moral change of the soul in this world. My opponent maintains that the moral change takes place after death, in the resurrection. I demanded the proof. But he has not found a text as proof, except this one about mortality putting on immortality; which, if applied to the soul, places all men on a level with the animal creation: while, I have shown you, from the Bible, that God has connected man's future destiny with a moral change, which is to be wrought on the soul in this life.

The world and the history of our race, are full of evidence, that men have lived in the very worst of crimes, and have died in the act of blasphemy—that, some in the very act of maliciously taking the life of their fellow, have themselves fallen by the assassin's hand, and gone directly into eternity with all their crimes, with their souls stained with every moral pollution. And the gentleman can find no proof of their salvation only from the xvth of 1 Cor.; and to apply that to their case, he must deny the immortality of the soul, contradict the universal conviction of man, and the solemn declaration of God. As counter proof, we have adduced a number of scriptures, to show that God has connected man's final destiny with faith and obedience in this life. And we now proceed to quote additional proof of this point: 1 Cor. xvi. 22, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema, Maranatha." Here is a moral quality of soul that is required of man by his Maker, as a condition of Divine acceptance, and without which he rests under the curse of God, both in time and in eternity.

We have shown that this moral change is inseparably connected with faith in this world, and that faith is impossible in the future world, and have called on our friend to controvert it; he has not done it. In the future world all is knowledge and sight, and not belief.

Again: we quote John xiv. 23: "Jesus answered and said unto him, if a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." Here it is plain that the proof



that we love God and have his favor, is, that we keep His words, that we repent and believe on Him and keep His commandments. Hence, every individual that neglects the moral precepts of the Gospel, gives proof that he loves not the Lord Jesus, and that he is living under the moral curse of God, and that passing out of this state of being with this character, there is no salvation for him. But to show that this moral character has reference to man's future destiny, see 1 John, iv. 16, 17: "And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God is him. Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment: because as he is, so are we in this world." This teaches that a man, to have the favor of God in the future world, at the judgment, must have his favor first in this world.

Again: in support of the position that God requires holiness of heart and life in this world, with special reference to man's future and final condition, we refer to the sayings of our Savior in Matt. v.; we will take only the 8th verse, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." And in connection, take what Paul says in Heb. xii. 14, "Follow peace with all men, and holiness without which no man shall see the Lord." Holiness is the result of faith. Here God has required of men the fulfillment of certain conditions, having direct reference to their future destiny in the coming world.

Now the position of the gentleman is, that God releases man from all moral obligation here, in reference to his future condition, and places his future salvation alone on the declaration—"This mortal must put on immortality." He passes over man's relation in this life, all his obligations to his Maker during his stay on earth, and tells men, I mean his system tells men, if you will believe in this world that all mankind will finally and unconditionally be saved, if you will turn Universalist here, you will be quite happy in believing, but if you live in unbelief you will be just as sure of heaven; it is a matter perfectly optional with you; God has not connected your future happiness with your moral character in this world:—while, the Bible

teaches, that the wrath of God abideth on him that continueth in unbelief in this world; and if he dies in this state, God's wrath will eternally abide on him. This is the true position on this point. But the system I oppose, because it is opposed to the Bible, says you need not reform, you need not pray, you need not abandon your profanity, you are just as sure of going to heaven in all your crimes as if you were already there. If I misrepresent the system, I challenge the gentleman to correct me. I challenge his brethren in the ministry, and the world, to deny, that the system says a man may live in unbelief, in perjury, in robbing, in murder, and if he is then tired of this Universalists hell, he may turn the key of heaven he has in his own hands, just cut his throat, and he is in heaven. I challenge any one to deny this if he dare. [Mr. LORING, a Universalist preacher, accepted the challenge.] The gentleman has accepted the challenge, laying himself under obligation to show, that men may be wicked enough in this life to keep them out of heaven in the future world. I thank the gentleman for it; and hope he will show it, for my work will then be done. For he will dig the grave of Universalism, and I will stay another week to preach its funeral sermon.—[*Time expired.*]

## [MR. DOOLITTLE'S THIRTEENTH SPEECH.]

I must admit friends that for once the benefit of a good dinner and the refreshment from rest during adjournment, has had considerable effect on our friend Power, and has aroused up considerable physical energy; if not mental. But unfortunately it has not strengthened his argument any, as he had referred to my being so much refreshed by my dinner, I was about to invite him to dine with me, but I think he has fared pretty well from his energy exhibited in his last speech. But let us review the argument and see if it has any weight.

He has not forgotten to tell you that this change is confined exclusively to the body and does not effect the soul. I shall not dwell on this much, but repeat to show that it is something that effects the soul, and places it beyond

the reach of sin and misery and renders it holy and happy. Our friend says that Paul exclaims, O death where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory? having reference [to himself and his brethren. Well if Paul exclaimed victory, in triumph with reference to himself and his brethren, did he exclaim on the ground that this change was to effect only the body, or because it included the soul likewise? Was it not for a victory over death and sin too? that by this glorious event, the sting of death would be taken away. Hence, he could say not only with reference to himself, but with reference to his friends as sharers in this resurrection, O death where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory? Yes my friends, in this glorious event which shall place all men beyond the reach of death, and sin, and every evil, all will shout victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

But on this question our friend thinks he has me in his grasp, and if I should plead ever so hard he would not relinquish his hold. He says that it is the body that puts on immortality and that this will not effect the condition of the soul at all. But mark, Paul says "it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption, it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory, it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power, it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body—as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." What constitutes the image of the heavenly? Why, spiritually being made equal to the angels, not subject to death any more. This constitutes the glorious change. And when this change is effected, the soul, in connection with this glorified, pure, incorruptible body, will be holy also. For mark, Rom. 8th. "The creature was made subject to vanity not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope." In hope of what? of deliverance from this vanity. "For the whole creation groaneth" what is the cause of this? they were subject to pain and suffering. But not subjected in eternal despair, but in hope of final deliverance. "Because the creature itself, also, shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into." What? is it a deliverance that effects the

body only? more, "into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Now this is all the deliverance I ask, here is an end of all pain and suffering. As farther proof that this change does embrace both soul and body, let me cite you to what Paul says 2 Cor. v. 1-3. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, for in this we groan earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so being clothed we shall not be found naked."

The soul and the body are inseparably connected in this world. There is something to be clothed when this tabernacle is dissolved. It is to be clothed in the likeness of Christ, to put on immortality and incorruption, and this clothing or house from heaven, will encircle the spirit, the soul. What does this "tabernacle" mean? It means our earthly nature or constitution—the Adamic nature. When this is put off, and the likeness of Christ put on, then the groaning has an end, and suffering has an end. Then shall be brought to pass the saying, repeatedly quoted, "Death is swallowed up in victory." Then the veil and covering shall be destroyed from off all people, then God shall wipe away the tears from off all faces—then shall be destroyed as Paul says, the last enemy, Death. Now I hope our friend here will not continue to tell you that this is a change that does not effect the soul or moral condition.

Again: we had to listen to the rehearsal of some statements made yesterday, all designed to work on your feelings and prejudices, making out that we are infidels in disguise, the worst kind of infidels. He has come here to expose our system, and he has cried infidelity. He tells you we pass over man's relation in this life. He tells you that our faith releases you from all obligation to discharge the duties of citizens and of Christians—that it releases, men from all obligation whatever. Now, there is not an intelligent individual here, but what knows this charge is slanderous and false. And we must believe that our friend is ignorant of the truth in this matter or else he willfully misrepresents us. I would beseech all my friends to put

the best construction on his motives, and not suppose he would come forth here boldly, and willfully misrepresent us. I told you yesterday that we hold, and that our system holds, that men are under obligation to do right in all respects in this life. We believe that holy and happy consequences attend obedience to God in this world, we believe in the reformation and improvement of society, and we enforce such things as much as our friend does. We believe that sin and misery are inseparably connected, that all who sin suffer the consequence of it, to the full extent of its desert. Now you all know that in controversy it is customary for one side to resort to such kind of arguments as our friend has used. "I am right and you are wrong, your system is calculated to open the floodgates of iniquity and deluge the world with moral pollution." This I say is common, but what does it amount to? Nothing at all is gained by it. Why, I could turn around and bring as many charges against my friend's system as he can against ours, but this would not amount to anything as an argument, mere assertion without proof avails nothing. Again, the gentleman says he has shown us that men die in unbelief, and that faith is impossible in the future world, i. e. there can be no change after this life. All I have to say on this point is, if no change passes on men for the better after this life, then their case is hopeless, and we may all lie down in despair. For the best Christians that ever lived, have mourned over their imperfections to the last. And when Paul exclaimed, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death." Did he expect to be delivered by his own good works? No. "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord," is his language. He found that when he would do good, evil was present with him, and that for all he could do, he was a wretched man—Jesus Christ alone could deliver him and not his good works. And this warfare in the mind of Paul, was kept up till the close of his course on earth. At another time later in life he says, "I keep my body under and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means, when I have preached to others I myself should be a cast away." Well would it be if all

would be as careful as Paul was lest they should be cast away. Paul got the victory, he remained steadfast to the end. But all have not been so fortunate. Many, even good preachers, have fallen away—as my friend is noting down, and will tell you, they were eternally cast away, I must forestall him here—says Paul. “This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners of whom I am chief.” Though men may backslide ever so far, they have not gone so far that the arm of Jehovah cannot reach them, nor become so vile that his redeeming grace cannot save them. But our friend says, that those who die in unbelief, will be miserable forever, and why? because he takes the promise of deliverance, into the glorious liberty of the children of God, and confines it entirely to the body. He says we cannot have faith in the future world. But why not have faith there? What do we understand by faith? it is used to mean confidence in God. When we get home to heaven, shall we have no confidence in God, no confidence in the stability of his throne? I admit that in respect to the promises of God, they will all have their fulfillment, but still we may thus have confidence in God for the continuation of his power and blessings upon us.

Some passages of scripture I have not noticed at this time, but will in my next speech. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER’S THIRTEENTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Judges and the Audience:*—I shall not occupy your time with desultory matters which have no direct bearing on the points of issue. A few passing remarks on the gentleman’s position. Paul, according to his account, was a very unskillful Universalist preacher. It was necessary for him to live holy and keep his body under lest he should be a cast away. Cast away from what? from heaven! By no means, from what then?

Again the gentleman concludes, that if his system is unsound, I must be lost. If this were a fact that I should be lost, it would be no proof against the system I maintain.

On this subject I have no fears, I rest my faith on the "rock of ages."

Christians have the consolation to know that in all their weakness, they have an advocate with the father, that their past sins are pardoned by faith in Jesus Christ, and the love of God shed abroad in their hearts. They have no fears in this world, and have a joyful hope for the future. Paul taught this doctrine to the Philippians. He says "I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Let us therefore as many as be perfect be thus minded"—for they were now perfected in the love of God and rejoicing in hope of eternal glory.

I have now but a remark to make on the gentleman's twelfth edition of this argument. His course reminds me forcibly of an incident that occurred when I had charge of the Wyandott Mission. A preacher who had never preached before by an interpreter, became very much embarrassed and to make his subject simple and plain, as he supposed, he used much repetition. He observed that the interpreter sometimes did not employ near so much time in speaking as he did, but only said a few words and waited for the preacher to proceed. After sermon, he enquired of the interpreter what this meant. "Why" says he, "I did not give them the repetition, but merely remarked about it—just as before." So all I have to do in noting down the gentleman's argument in each successive speech is to write "just as before."

We called upon Mr. D., to touch the difficulty about the mortality of the soul. He came near to it, and quoted "it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power &c." Where sown? In the grave. What sown? Now we repeat, if he applies this to the soul, he places man on a level with the ox and the ass.

It is plain he wishes to get out of his present difficulties and get into another channel, if he can do it without observation. He has staked his argument on the resurrection, effected by a finite power. But he begins to see his difficulties, and now he wants to double the cape and take another channel. Instead of the body being raised as de-

scribed in 1 Cor. xv, he wants to make out that there is a house in heaven, and we shall be clothed upon with that house and that it will encircle the soul and be the resurrection body. So instead of going into the future world with a resurrection body, we shall be clothed around with this heavenly house.

Now here is a difficulty for him, I will show you by testimony that is indisputable that this is not a house, but a real body, that is to be *raised* and refined, and immortalized by the divine hand. Philip. iii. 20, 21. "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change *our vile body*, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself."

You will mark here that it is *our vile body*, that is to be changed and fashioned like unto his glorious body, in the future world.

Well he brought again the eighth of Romans. And like the Indian interpreter, I wrote, "just as before."

You will recollect that he staked the whole change on the resurrection, and took the ground that the agent in this was a finite power, and to effect the whole work, the soul must be mortal. But we have shown that the moral change takes place in this world, sanctifying the soul and fitting it for heaven, and that if men here reject God's plan of being prepared for heaven, they shall be deprived of his favor and love through all eternity.

In reference to the liberty of the children of God spoken of in Romans. Paul makes it plain that this is enjoyed in this world. For he says, "as many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons, or children, of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby, we cry, Abba Father. The spirit also beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." What language can make it plainer that we become the children of God in this life?

I wish to meet the gentleman's charge of slander. I never entered a campaign without expecting to be shot at,



and I find that under all these personalities severe as they are, my feelings are "calm as summer evenings be." And I beg of the congregation not to think hard of Mr. D., for his charges, for it is the corruption of his system that drives him to such a course, and it is against his system that I direct my charges. I charge Universalism with maintaining directly in opposition to the proof I have adduced, that God does not require obedience of man or has not connected faith, love and holiness in this life with man's eternal destiny. And for this, the gentleman says I am guilty of falsehood and slander, and he says his system does maintain that men are under obligations to discharge all their duties to God and man. But I now bring up the point most definitely, that the system does maintain that God has laid no man or woman of our race, under obligations to believe, love, or obey him as a condition of final salvation in heaven. I lay this charge on the table before the gentleman and challenge him to deny it. I lay it before his brethren in the ministry and challenge them to deny it. The moment they take the ground that God lays any individual under obligations to perform any duty, and that he cannot be saved in heaven, if he fails to perform this duty, then they take the ground that their whole system is false from beginning to end.

Now, that there may be no misunderstanding on this subject, we repeat, that the system does maintain that men are under no obligations to believe in God, or to discharge any duties either to God or man, as conditions or means of salvation in heaven, but only as a condition of being peaceful and happy in this life. Till the gentleman denies this, and brings the proof, he only renders himself ludicrous by his charges against us of slander. The system holds that men are under obligation to love and obey God and do good to their fellow men, but only for their own good in this world. But what if a man should see fit to disbelieve, and hate God, and injure his fellow men, would this shut him out of heaven? If he should see fit to live in all manner of crime and blasphemy possible, hang himself and go into eternity a self-murderer, would this keep him out of heaven for a moment? If so, then Universalism is the great-

est, the most deceptive, and ruinous imposition that ever cursed the world. We have shown you under four distinct heads, that God requires duties at the hands of men in this life, as conditions and means of happiness in eternity. 1. We have shown that he that believeth shall have eternal life, and that he that believeth not shall be damned. When we pass beyond this life, faith is absolutely impossible. The gentleman tried to avoid this difficulty by making faith only an abstract principle, but it was only an evasion. 2. We have shown you that those who are corrupt have no part in the eternal life with God and Christ. 3. We have shown you that God requires men to love him in this world, and that this love is inseparably connected with faith. 4. We have shown you that without holiness no man shall see the Lord. Again we have seen that the conditions as laid down in the viiith of Rom. require a moral change in this life to fit men for heaven. "The spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God."

Here you see the system is diametrically opposed to the teachings of the Bible. It places the whole change in the resurrection power, and that power is to be exerted by finite hands.

Now gentleman, not one of the texts used to establish the points I have stated, has he attempted fairly to meet. I propose now to show that this system not only stands diametrically opposed to God's word, but that it holds out the highest reward for the most glaring crime the Bible forbids. Universalism maintains that it is absolutely impossible for men to commit sin enough in life and in death, to keep them out of heaven in a future world, this my opponent dare not deny, for the very moment he concedes that any man may by any possibility commit crimes that will keep him out of heaven, he concedes what annihilates his system. In proof, David says in the 55th Ps. that "bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days." Now this system says to the bloody and deceitful men, if you do not live out half your days, if you will put yourselves out of the world, you will be saved in heaven. God forbids murder, but this system says, to the bloody and

deceitful man if you will only cut your throat, you will be released from hell and crowned in heaven.

Now that system which releases men from all obligation to do right so far as their final salvation is concerned, and then offers them the highest reward in heaven, for the commission of the most glaring crime that God forbids in this world, is to all intents and purposes, the most mischievous form of infidelity. But this is Universalism, and I ask the gentleman to deny the charge if he pleases. I demand of him to meet the charge specifically, without evasion, and he can evade it only at the peril of his own, and the reputation of his system. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S FOURTEENTH SPEECH.]

Perhaps some of you my friends after so much thunder and lightning, begin to feel that we must be struck, or that something at least must have happened to us. But we feel perfectly cool, while our friend is waxing warm, I hope he will take a draught of water and try to keep cool, for the worst of his trouble is yet to come.

He tries to make out that our system is a most awful system. I hope your bumps of caution are large and that you will all take sufficient care, for the system is an awful one, if all he says is true. It releases men from all obligation to love God, or in any way to respect the rights of their fellow men, or to do any thing that is right or commendable, if his assertions are to be taken as matters of fact. We are in an astonishing condition, and it is passing strange that there should be so many Universalists in the world, and it is very surprising that so many Methodist preachers should have been converted to it. We have many whom we respect, that were once in the ranks of our friend, that are now advocating the doctrine we profess.

And we hope that many more will yet be converted, and that our friend will be. But is it not surprising that if the system has such awful horns, and claws, or is such a monster, with cloven feet—if it is such an outrage on heaven, is at war with God, and with all the prin-

ciples of his government, at war with the whole system of christianity,—is it not strange that some of the most enlightened in all ages should have believed and preached it, and that so large and respectable a portion of the community now should hold to it? Now, it may possibly be, that our friend is mistaken in what he has said. It may not be true. So I beseech of you my friends to cherish the idea that *possibly* our friend may be mistaken.

But, I do not blame him for the course he has taken, for he had nothing better to say. He could not lay hold on my arguments on the resurrection, though he says I have given him the twelfth edition of it. But I am thankful I have not to take his *ipse dixit* for proof. Why does he not go to the law and to the testimony to prove our theory false, and to sustain his negative on this question. To assail our system with hard sayings, to arouse your prejudice, does not prove it false, and it does no good.

The gentleman says that we hold to a system which says to the bloody and deceitful man, "Cut your throat, and as a reward for so doing you shall have eternal life in the future world." Now we deny this altogether. Do you believe my friends, that we hold any such thing? If you do you have our sympathy, but I will say we hold no such thing. And I might say the charge is false. But our friend says we are too personal in this, I will not then, say it is false, but simply ask you, do you believe it is true? that we offer eternal life to a man for cutting his throat? Did you ever hear of a Universalist who said such a thing, or wrote such a thing? No! Never! Never! A man must be morally mad to do it. And yet our friend says our system holds such a doctrine—holds out the highest reward to the cut throat. If this is our doctrine, and our public advocates have been faithful in preaching it, why have they not induced at least the good, who are in suffering and want, to cut their throats? Why is it that individuals all over the land are not cutting their throats?

Our friend Power told us he had strong hopes of getting to heaven. But if he is not saved on the Universalist

plan, he will never be saved. For if he is not saved by the grace of God, there is no other way in which he can be saved. I will not say it will be a stretch of Divine grace to save him, but if he is saved, as he has sinned against much light, I say he must be saved, if at all, as indeed we all must be by the grace of God, and not by works. We must be saved by the free unmerited gift of God's unpurchased mercy. Why our friend said yesterday, he expected when he got home, to shout grace, for the salvation of his soul. He expected his soul to be washed in the blood of the Lamb. Well, this is our faith. We believe every soul that is saved, will be washed and saved in heaven by the same process—by the renovating power of God's grace. But my friends we believe more than our friend Power does, and for this he calls us by hard names. We believe that the worst of sinners by the same process, yea all will be saved, and fitted for the enjoyment of the Kingdom of God. Again, he says and he thinks it is proof, that idolaters and all liars &c., shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. But now, if I am not mistaken, the declaration does not stand thus. "No liar &c., *hath* (in the present tense) any part in the Kingdom of God. But some will say drunkards will be there and how can this be? Why they will be purified, as you will be purified. Now why did not our friend Power quote the scripture, and quote it correctly? And why did he not tell us that there shall be such persons as adulterers, and whoremongers, and murderers in eternity? Why did he not do this? For the very good reason he could not bring any law and testimony to prove it, but on the other hand, he knew that I had proved that the crooked ways shall all be "made straight,—that all shall be purified and made obedient to God—that sinners to the uttermost shall be saved—that the Savior, having tasted death for every man and seen of the travail of his soul, shall be satisfied—and that all men shall be redeemed, and be holy. Now he cannot prove that all men will not be redeemed and will not be made holy and happy. But he will tell you that he quoted from Rev., that "all liars, idolaters" &c., shall have their part in the lake of fire &c., and

that this is in the future world, and therefore they can never be saved. Now this passage does not prove any such thing—it proves simply this, that these sinners, as a specimen of all sinners—and this too was a pledge of what shall be done for all sinners, that these sinners shall undergo a process of purification. Fire denotes a process of purification—a moral process here—a sovereign fire for purification, and not for damnation, a fire that separates the dross from the gold, and makes it fit for the owners use. Fire in the Bible is used in two senses, a figurative and moral sense,—as a figure it is used to denote great calamities, or misfortunes, that war or famine, or some calamity of this kind is to come on a nation. Again it is used in a moral sense to denote that process under the government of God by which sinners are purified and fitted for heaven.

I will give you proof of this, from the law and the testimony, for I do not rest this matter on assertion as the Elder does. 1 Cor. iii. 13-15 “Every man’s works shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is. If any man’s work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.” Here is a purifying process by fire! and it is not said that any one shall be consumed by it, or damned and lost forever—but *shall be saved*, yet so as by fire.

It is said of Christ, he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver. What is a refiner’s fire used for? for a bad purpose? to destroy any thing good or valuable? No, but to separate that which is evil from the good, separate the dross from the gold. Again, truth is like the fuller’s soap: Well fullers soap is not used for a bad purpose, only to separate that which is filthy and worthless from the valuable. John the Baptist says of Christ. “He shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost and with fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and will gather the wheat into his garner, but the chaff he will burn with fire unquenchable.” Now, this means that all

stand here growing up as wheat, encompassed with this earthy nature—but shall be redeemed and purified by this process, cleansed from all sin, and gathered at last, into the garner of the Lord. Says our Savior, with respect to this, “For every one shall be salted with fire.” And the Apostle says, “That which beareth briars and thorns is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned.” The same figure is carried out in all these passages. The Agriculturist, having a piece of ground yielding briars and thorns—but desirous of having it produce a more valuable crop, causes it to undergo a process of fire. So in a moral sense. We have all borne the briars and thorns—“The fruits of the flesh are manifest, wrath, strife, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings,” &c. Now this lake of fire and brimstone, in which all unbelievers, liars, adulterers, &c., shall have a part, is the same process of fire. The result will be the same—the purification of those submitted to its trial—and the destruction of sin, death and the Devil.

[Time expired.]

[MR. POWER'S FOURTEENTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Judges and the Congregation.*—We will make a few passing remarks on the gentleman's last labored speech. He without taking up the scriptures I had adduced, and examining them by themselves, gave them a running notice, with the charge, which I deny, of misquoting, and then took up the text, in 1st. Cor. iii. explaining the passage in Rev. by it. Now, he assumes, as the basis of his interpretation, that the hay, wood and stubble, mean our pride and imperfections &c., in this world. This is the basis—remove this and all his labor is lost.

We deny that this is the Apostle's meaning here. The ministers of the Gospel are represented as the builders, and the members of the visible church, as the materials of which the building is constructed. And in the building is included, with reference to their individual moral character, those represented by hay, wood, and stubble, And no where in the Bible are mere abstract principles or prac-

tices of men either good or bad represented as a building. And I object to the interpretation on this ground—if any man's works, that is, seduction, murder, robbery, &c., be burned, destroyed, or cleansed from him, he shall suffer loss. As if it were a loss for any one to be saved from these crimes, and cleansed from all iniquity! The Holy Spirit could never teach such a doctrine, for it would encourage all to live in crimes, for if they are burned, or they are saved from sin, they suffer loss! But to refer to the ministry. Ministers receive into the church, all they suppose to be converted, and sometimes admit those that ought not to belong to the church, in the state they are in. Now, at the day of judgment his church will be tried, and those who are not pure, shall be rejected, and the minister, shall suffer loss, but shall himself be saved, yet so as by fire. And that the gentleman's position utterly fails, is clear from the text itself. He maintains that the fire there spoken of is a purifying process by which men are fitted for heaven. And he has told us in other places that men are fitted for heaven by the renovating power of God's grace. And you will all recollect that up to his last, speech he has maintained that the resurrection alone effected the change, both physical and moral, that fitted men for heaven. But now, he finds it convenient to reject all his former positions, and take the ground that a fire of some kind is necessary to effect this purification.

I remind you again my friends to look at the sign over his door.

Finally, in reference to this purifying process by fire. The passage says, that all the wicked spoken of shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone—which is the second death. This is a spiritual death. Then according to the gentleman, those subject to it, are purified into a second spiritual death. Now, this is a kind of purifying process the Bible knows nothing about. It is a process which purifies into a moral and spiritual death!!

Now to the main subject. You recollect the charge I brought against the system I oppose, and that I challenged the gentleman or any one to deny it.



I repeat, I charge the system, with having released men from all obligation to love or obey God, or to regard the rights of their fellow men, with reference to their final salvation. It holds that a man may live in all the abominations and crimes, which it is possible for man to commit, and then die by his own hand, and yet be unconditionally sure of Heaven. I challenge the gentleman to deny this. He did not deny this charge in his last evasive speech. And no one has dared to deny it.

The only point on which he attempted to raise a little dust, was that I had charged the system with offering a reward for the commission of crime.

Now, if I assure any individual that if he will perform a particular work, he will inherit a large estate, would I not be holding out a reward for the performance of that act? The system I oppose says to every individual, if you are tired of suffering, the universalist's hell is in this world, you have the key in your own hand, just turn the bolt, commit suicide, and you shall be crowned in heaven as the result.

You may call this offering a reward or what you please, I am not particular about what term you use, the *fact* stands out in bold relief. The gentleman enquires, why do we not see persons all over the land cutting their throats! This the advocates of the system must answer themselves. But I think the reason is, they have not faith enough in their theory to reduce it to practice. If their system be true, they might terminate their life here, and go to heaven before sun down. But they dare not try it.

I now proceed with my arguments.

The gentleman thinks after all, that we must be saved by grace. Here he has turned another corner. A little while since we were to be saved by the resurrection. He has quoted the passage which says, "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ," and I intend now to show, that his system rejects Jesus Christ to all intents and purposes, as a Savior. If Christ saves sinners or the world of sinners, it must be from future punishment for sin, or from the commission of sin,

or from the punishment of sin in this life. Take away these and what salvation is left for Christ to perform? But does Christ save men from future punishment? No. The system maintains that there is no such punishment in the universe.

Again: does Jesus Christ save men from the commission of sin in this world? No. The gentleman has saved me the trouble of proof on this point. He says every individual, including myself in particular, has sin and impurity till death. Then there is no grace offered in Christ as a Savior from future punishment, or from the commission of sin in the present life. Then if the gentleman has a Savior at all, it must be to save from the punishment of sin in this world. But does the system save men from the punishment of sin in this world? No. It holds that every sin is punished in this world, according to its full deserts. This is the peculiarity of the system. Now I ask how is Jesus Christ a Savior at all? What does he save from? All the Savior we have according to the gentleman is the resurrection, or the power exerted in the resurrection. And to make this, or Christ in it a Savior, he has to deny the immortality of the soul, and place us all on a level with the beasts; and he has this resurrection effected by a finite power, or makes God give up his omnipotence and cease to be God, and lands us in atheism. We hold therefore, that a system that rejects and contradicts, all the cardinal doctrines of the holy Scriptures, cannot be supported by the authority of the Bible, and is to all intents and purposes, a system of stubborn infidelity. And I maintain that Universalism does do this,—that it turns man loose in the world, and releases him from all restraint, and does to all intents and purposes reject Jesus Christ as a Savior, and makes the sinner suffer for his own sins; it takes the sinner to heaven not by grace, but on the ground alone of sheer justice,—it says the sinner has never been pardoned for a solitary sin, that he has been punished for every sin to the last farthing, and that he can claim salvation as his right on the score of justice.

I remind this respected audience again that I allow all to universalism that it claims, *i. e.* that man is under obliga-

tion to God and man in this world, not in reference to his eternal condition, but wholly and exclusively to his condition in this world. It teaches that it will make him more happy in this world, but no surer of heaven in the future world. Hence it is perfectly at his option, whether he will be moral in this world or not. If he purpose to live in hell—the universalist's hell—in this world, he can, and he will lose nothing in future by it. If he prefers to go to the card table, or to the house of crime, he is at liberty to make his choice. If he goes one night, he can if he chooses, the next night creep back into the Universalist's hell: for God has given him the power of choice. Or if he choose he can come out of hell and enter into heaven; but should he shun all this and live a virtuous life, he is no more sure of heaven in the future world, than if he lived here in all manner of crime. † [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FOOLITTLE'S FIFTEENTH SPEECH.]

Our friend has said a good many things which we can give a passing notice only. He has recapitulated some of his charges again, I have but little to say about them. They may go for all they are worth. I have found from observation that when an opponent, was hard crowded and had no better arguments, he would in the place of arguments resort to hard sayings.

With respect to the purifying process by fire, our friend says if persons would suffer loss as described, they would prefer not to have their works burned. Now this is a curious way of getting along with this matter. Suffer loss of what? of anything valuable? No, they shall lose the wood, hay, and stubble, and no great calamity either. I should think if I had been building with such materials, the sooner they were lost the better. Now such things only are to be lost—nothing that is considered valuable. "But he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." Hence it is plain that the scripture represents this as a process of purification, not of damnation. But he says this purifies them, into the second death, which he says is a spiritual

• death. Now I ask what will become of his second death, "when death the *last* enemy shall be destroyed?" I conclude that this will be the end of sin, the destruction of the briars and thorns, the purification from all dross.

The gentleman says I dare not deny—what? why, in substance that the chief of sinners may be saved by the grace of God. [Mr. Power here said, this was an evasion.] But still I say it is the substance of the charge.

It is the opinion of many that no man ever committed suicide in his reason. But admitting they do go out of the world as sinners, he has represented me as denying that they may be saved by the grace of God. Well this is a very strange idea—very strange that the greatest of sinners may not be saved. Do you think my friends it would be any stretch of infinite mercy to save the greatest of sinners? I read in the bible that the worst of sinners, may be saved, "the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin" "and this is a faithful saying," says Paul, "that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief." Did Christ come into the world to do a work that he was unable to perform? Now with respect to the greatest of sinners, Paul in 1 Cor. vi. mentions some of the worst classes, adulterers, thieves, drunkards, &c., and says "such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God." Here then the worst of sinners are saved, and will our friend limit the power of God? and will he limit the exertion of this power to a particular day or hour, and say thus far shalt thou go and no farther? Will he, a feeble worm of the dust, dare to limit the power of the Holy One of Israel? Strange presumption!

Again: the gentleman says that our system holds that every man has the keys of heaven and hell in his own hands. I hold no such thing. The keys of heaven and hell are in the hands of the Lord Jesus Christ, he shall open and no man shut, and shut and no man open.

Again: he says that our system denies that Christ is the Savior of the world. This is not true—we teach no such doctrine. What? Universalism teach thus, and then

we preach universal salvation through Christ! What consistency in such a charge as this.

Again: he says our system robs God of his omnipotence—that God imparts this omnipotence to Christ, and thus deprives himself of it, and this amounts to Atheism. But why does he say this? We believe we showed that the scriptures teach that God imparts power enough to Jesus Christ to enable him to accomplish the object of his mission, and still he holds the reins of government himself. Now we will present the gentleman with some more proof with another argument. But before I adduce it, I want you to bear in mind, that he says all must be converted in this world in order to be saved in the future world, I will now adduce proof that all will be converted ultimately, Phil. ii. 10–11. “That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* under the earth; And *that* every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.” “A form of expression which is the strongest in the Bible,” says Prof. Stewart “to denote the whole intelligent universe.” Now mark what John says respecting this confession 1 John iv. 15, “Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.”—“1 John v. 1, Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God.”

As farther proof, I cite your attention to the declaration of Paul 1 Cor. xii. 3, “Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the spirit of God, calleth Jesus accursed: and *that* no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.”

Mark, the point to be proved is that every one will be converted or born of God, and we have proved that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue confess, and the language here used is the strongest in the Bible, to denote the whole intelligent universe. And John tells us that whoever makes this confession is born of God, and Paul informs us that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost, this then proves that all will be born again, and that this is brought about by the influence of the spirit of God on the heart. Now for

the conclusion of the matter Rom. v. 19-21. "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." Here on this passage, or on the last verse, I wish to introduce the remarks of Dr. Adam Clark, a man who for learning, eminent talents, and deep piety, has not been excelled in this age. Verse 21. *That as sin hath reigned unto death.* "As extensively, as deeply, as universally, as *sin* whether implying, *the act of transgression* or the *impure principle* from which the act proceeds, or *both*:—*hath reigned*, subjected the whole earth, and all its inhabitants, the whole soul, and all its powers, and penalties *unto death temporal*, of the *body*, *spiritual* of the *soul* and *eternal* of *both*; even so as extensively, deeply and universally, *might grace reign*, filling the whole earth, and prevailing, purifying, and refining the soul,—*through righteousness*, through this doctrine of *free salvation*, by the blood of the Lamb, and by the principle of *holiness* transfused through the soul by the Holy Ghost, *unto eternal life*;—the proper object of an immortal spirit's hope, the only sphere where the human intellect can rest and be happy in the *place* and *state* where God is, where he is seen *AS HE IS*, and where he can be enjoyed without interruption in an eternal progression of knowledge and beatitude, by *Jesus Christ our Lord*, as the cause of our salvation, the *means* by which it is communicated, and the *source* which it springs." Thus we find that the salvation from sin here is as extensive and complete as the *guilt* and *contamination* of sin, death is conquered, hell is disappointed, the devil confounded, and sin totally destroyed. Here is glorying, "*to him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and has made us kings and priests to God and his Father, be glory and dominion forever and ever, Amen.* Halleluiah, the Lord God omnipotent reigneth! Amen, and Amen!!" Now who can preach Universalism stronger than this? And who wants anything to teach

more satisfactory universal salvation from all sin, than this passage of scripture ? [*Time expired.*]

[Here it was agreed by the speakers to meet in the morning and make their summing up speeches on the first question and proceed to the discussion of the second question.]

---

FRIDAY MORNING, AUG. 1—9 O'CLOCK.

[Mr. Power arose and stated, that on the proposition of Mr. Doolittle, he would now make his closing speech on the first question. And Mr. Doolittle interrupted to explain, and near a half hour was taken up in explanatory remarks on both sides. The substance of which was, that Mr. Doolittle, had not proposed to close his affirmative, because he had adduced all the proof he might, but because he supposed they could not remain long enough to give an equal amount of time to the second question, unless they closed the first then; but as Mr. Power was willing to stay six months if necessary, and there was nothing of importance in the way of Mr. Doolittle's remaining some time, it was concluded to go on with the discussion of the first question, especially as Mr. Doolittle had quite an amount of new proof he wished to bring forward on his affirmative.]

[MR. POWER'S FIFTEENTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators.*—I arise to reply to the gentleman's speech on last evening, and adduce my counter proof against his system. The first remark I make is on his comments on my reply to his interpretation and application of 1 Cor. iii. concerning the wood, hay, stubble, &c. He occupied half his time in answering a position which I did not take, viz. That a man suffers loss in having his errors, sins and corruptions separated from him. I was astonished at this, and wondered what could have led him into such an absurdity. What I said was that

the gentleman's interpretation involved this absurdity, that it was a loss for men to be saved from their sins or imperfections of any kind. Now, every one knows that it is a real benefit for a man to lose his faults. But his interpretation makes it a real loss.

I am willing to refer the passage in Rev. to his friend Dr. Clarke, to whom he refers so much. For he fixed the fire there spoken of in the future world, and says there is no recovery from this *second death*.

I proceed now to notice his proof texts, and I call special attention to this matter. He quoted from Phil. ii. 1 John v.—1 Cor. xii.—and Rom. v., for this object—to prove that all men would be regenerated in this world. What was this for? Why, that they might be prepared for heaven hereafter. But you will recollect, that in his main proof text, regeneration was not necessary. He staked his entire system on the resurrection, and rested his whole proof on the fact that the change was to take place in the resurrection. You remember that he announced to us, that if the xvth of 1 Cor. did not prove his position there was no proof under heaven that would. But now he leaves that ground entirely, and undertakes to prove that all this change takes place in this world. He abandons the strongest proof under heaven, according to his own showing, and takes this new ground, fundamentally different from his first position. Well, I am glad to try every point under heaven where he thinks his system can find rest for its feet a single moment.

A remark with reference to the quotation from Rom. v. and Dr. Clarke's comment. If Dr. Clarke gave the gentleman's views here, it was not because he had any fellowship with his system, for he says respecting it,—“I have read the best things that have been written in favor of it, but I never saw a production but what sound learning and criticism should be ashamed to acknowledge.”

But to the criticism: “That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign.” Take notice, does it say, grace *does* reign? No. So *might* grace reign. On what terms *might* it reign? Why the Apostle explains on what condition, in the first part of the chapter. There-



fore being justified by faith,"—here is the condition on which this grace is to reign. It is by being *justified by faith*, that "we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." This is Paul's own interpretation of the principle on which we are to have peace with God. And he has further said that "without faith it is impossible to please God."

Turn now to 1 Cor. xii. 3, and observe the gentleman's main point is to prove that all are regenerated in this world. "Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the spirit of God, calleth Jesus accursed: and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." This passage the gentleman makes parallel with Phil. ii. 9—11. "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* under the earth; and *that every* tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

The argument here is that the last quotation announces, that every individual of our race shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord. And the quotation from Cor. shows that no man can call Jesus the Lord but by the Holy Ghost. And the conclusion is that all are regenerated by the power of the Holy Ghost.

Now the difficulty in the case is, he has blended two subjects which are clearly different, and by this has arrived at his conclusion. In the xii. of Cor., the case is clearly defined. The Apostle is speaking of the peculiar gifts of the spirit, and not with regard to the work of regeneration of the heart at all. In respect to the gift of prophecy, if a man called Jesus accursed, it was evidence that he was an imposter, for the true prophet that was inspired with the Holy Ghost, knew that Jesus was the Lord. Of these things he would not have his brethren ignorant, in order that they might discern who were true prophets and who were imposters. There is not a word here about regeneration.

In respect to Phil. the Apostle is speaking of the sov-

ereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ. It had pleased God to exalt him, and give him a name above every name, that all should bow to him as a sovereign, and every tongue confess that he is Lord. But does this teach that he will absolutely regenerate every man? There is not a word about regeneration in the text. And the gentleman's sophistry consists in bringing regeneration into the conclusion, when it is not to be found in the premises. Or he assumes that to bow the knee to Christ as a sovereign, and confess that he is Lord, is equivalent to regeneration. This I deny. The Devils confess all this; but they are not regenerated. All this passage teaches, is that all men should, or ought to confess the sovereignty of Jesus Christ.

But he wished us to take particular notice of the quotation from 1 John. v. 1, and this we readily do: for it destroys his whole argument. For he holds that men are regenerated without repentance, faith or obedience in this life. I fix this on his argument and he cannot get away from it. He has to maintain the unconditional salvation of all men in heaven without any of these qualities in this life. And unless he proves that all men may go to heaven without believing in Christ, he does not sustain his position,—this is absolutely essential to his argument.

Let us now examine his proof. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God, and every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him." I ask, does John say that the whole human family is regenerated? No. But every one that *believeth* in Jesus Christ, is born of God. And what proof do they give that they are born of God, and does God require any proof? Yes, evidence, visible, practical, personal evidence is required to show that one is counted the child of God. Let us read the next three verses in proof. "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous. For whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, *even our faith.*"

Mr. D. read only the first verse: because what follows did not suit his purpose. It teaches most explicitly that God does require of men in this world as evidence that they are his children, love, obedience, and faith. Now the conclusion is, which no man can deny, that if a man does not exercise faith, and keep his commandments, he does not love God, neither is beloved of God, and is under condemnation, no matter what his pretensions may be. So much for his proof texts.

And another position he took was, that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth the whole human family from all sin. Here is another change of position. First, it was the resurrection that was to do this. But seeing that this is a hopeless case, he now abandons it. He abandons the scripture on which he rested his whole system, the strongest proof in the Bible, the proof that sustained his position, or else no proof can do it.

But we showed yesterday that his system rejects Jesus Christ as a Savior entirely. We showed that the system maintains that the grace of Christ does not save men from danger of punishment in a future world, nor from the commission of sin in this world; nor from the punishment of sin in this world; for there is according to the system, no danger of punishment in the future, and it does not deny that men live and die in sin in this world, but acknowledges it fully, and takes the ground that all are punished on earth to the full desert of their crimes. So all can see the gentleman has wholly abandoned his first position, that the resurrection effects the change in man to fit him for heaven, and now takes the ground that the blood of Jesus Christ effects all this change—the moral change that fits for heaven. But does the blood of Christ save men from the punishment of sin in a future life? No, says my friend, for they are never exposed to punishment after death. But does it save men from the commission of sin in this world. No, he must answer, for men do live and die in sin in this world. Well then does the blood of Christ save men from the punishment of sin in this world? No, says his system, man is to be punished for all his sins in this life to the full

extent of his deserts. Consequently the system rejects the life and death and blood of Christ as a Savior, and denies the necessity of the influence of the Holy Spirit in regeneration. For if, as a matter of fact, men have to suffer the punishment due to all their crimes to the full extent in this world,—they can claim heaven as a matter of justice, independent of God's grace—independent of the atonement of Christ—independent of the Holy Spirit in regeneration, and independent of every other principle but stern justice. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S SIXTEENTH SPEECH.]

The first statement I notice is this: Mr. Power says that I staked my ground and rested solely for my support on the resurrection of all men to an immortal state of existence.

And he says that in my last speech last evening, I turned a somerset. Now I would say that I do not claim much skill at such feats, and will accredit to my friend greater skill than I possess.

But he says I at first rested for proof solely on the resurrection of all men, which would make them incorruptible, and make them equal to the angels, and bring them into the glorious liberty of the children of God, and that I maintained this up to last evening, and then abandoned my ground and predicated the proof on the ground that all men would be regenerated in this life. But, we say this is not the fact, and you will see that it is not.

I told you that I considered the argument from the resurrection sufficient proof, provided there was no other argument in the Bible. But I did not rest solely on that, I hold on other proof. And in connection with that proof—which I said was sufficient proof alone, but which did not stand alone, I brought forward other proof. But in doing so I have not abandoned the position I first took. My friend is mistaken. I still hold on to the proof of the resurrection, and all the means of the grace of God and the power of that grace, as connected with the great scheme of redemption, from the first development of it

through all its manifestations, in the laboring, suffering and death of Jesus Christ to the final consummation of the great work. But I said that the resurrection was the last crowning act. It was the capstone to the great building. And to prove that this was the last work, I quoted "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power." Then the last enemy shall be destroyed, and Jesus Christ himself be subject to the Father, and God shall be all in all. When God shall be all in all in this sense, then all shall be sanctified and become his fit subjects, by the power of the spirit of his grace and truth. But my friends this is the completion of the great work that is begun here. It is not the whole of it, but the last crowning act. We must take into consideration all things connected with the great scheme of redemption, and consider each part as a link in this great chain. The grace of God, and the blood of Christ are links in this chain as important as any other, it takes all these things connected to complete the chain. And when I take up one of these links to speak of its importance in this great scheme, I do not by any means abandon any other point which is just as important as this. I do hope hereafter when I am speaking of the importance of any one of these things that belong to the great work, I shall not be accused of changing my ground.

I want you to bear in mind that I did not take the position that men are fully qualified on earth for heaven. Even the best Christians, the greatest saints that ever lived, I said had the seeds of corruption in them until death. And I stated that as good a man as our friend Power is, that unless he experienced more of a change for the better than he had yet experienced, this side the grave, he could not enter heaven. Proof:

"There is not a just man upon the earth that doeth good and sinneth not." "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." Now if our friend comes up and tells us that he is without sin, the Apostle will tell him that the truth is not in him. Hence I say as the *best* Christians have sin about them till death,

it needs the resurrection as the last crowning act of Almighty Grace and Redeeming Power, which shall not only redeem all Christians, but the whole intelligent creation, and deliver them from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God, and make them equal unto the angels and children of God, being children of the resurrection, and not subject to death any more. And without this crowning act the greatest Christian may despair of purity and heaven, and immortal happiness.

We would not at all detract from Christian graces, but say that no man arrives at sinless perfection in this life. This change is effected in the last act, by the power of the resurrection. It is the opinion of the most intelligent divines, and of a great body of Christians, that the best are not perfect in this life, but the perfection began here is perfected at death.

My friend accuses me of changing my ground in taking the position that salvation is by grace, in my interpretation of the 5th of Rom. Now I want to take up this passage to show you that salvation here is of grace alone, and is not predicated on good works.

Let us see if we are mistaken in the premises here. Mark the reading of this and see if there are any works of the creature that saves him:

"But as the offence so is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, [ mark the parallel that is kept up here and see how clearly the remedy is made as extensive as the disease] much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ hath abounded unto many." Now mark the parallel while the same *many* that fall into sin—the *many* that received the gift of God through grace. "And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgment was by one to condemnation; but the gift is of many offences to justification." The gift is *free*, not obtained by the works of the creature. "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much more they who receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one Jesus Christ." Now mark the conclusion of the matter.

"Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; *even so* by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." The same *all* shall receive the free gift unto justification of life. The parallel kept up here throughout the whole, necessarily makes this so. This is the argument of the Apostle. And he adds, to make the argument still stronger if possible. "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." The same many that were made sinners by the disobedience of one, are to be made righteous by the obedience of one. "Moreover the law entered that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded grace did much more abound. That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." And do you not recollect what I quoted from Dr. Clarke, in which he says "that the salvation from sin here is as extensive and complete as the guilt and condemnation of sin." And my friends we need no greater salvation than a salvation from sin.—But our friend Power tells us that this is a limited salvation. But Paul says as the offence came upon *all even so* the free gift came upon *all*. And Dr. Clarke says the salvation from sin is as extensive as the condemnation of sin. Now how extensive is the condemnation of sin? Paul tells us "that by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, *for that all have sinned.*" Then as the remedy is as extensive, all men will be saved from sin. The conclusion then from this text is that the salvation of all men is complete. And as Dr. Clarke says, death is conquered, hell is disappointed, and the devil is confounded, and sin totally destroyed:

I hope our friend will bear this argument in mind. And that this light and knowledge may produce in him conversion before he leaves.

But he finds fault with my argument from this passage in Phil. "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name. That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of

things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth. And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Proof—Stewart tells us that the phraseology here, is a Hebraism, used to denote the whole intelligent universe, that it is the strongest language that could be used to denote this. And this kind of bowing and confessing must mean humble submission to the government of God. Because the same Apostle tells you, "That no man can say that Jesus Christ is Lord but by the Holy Ghost." Hence my argument was, that this universal confession made by the influence of the Holy Ghost was evidence that all will be changed by the influence of God's grace on the soul, and render perfect obedience unto God; and be holy and happy in heaven.

Again; I quoted from 1 John. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." This goes to strengthen the argument. But in further confirmation of it let me tell you that the quotation from Phil. is parallel to a text in Isa. xlv. 22-23 "look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none else." Now see if there is any condition of faith or obedience on our part on which we are saved—I have sworn by myself saith Jehovah "that unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear." To make it sure that all should be saved through Jesus Christ, he makes his promise with an oath, and God's word will not return to him void. For thus saith God "so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth, it shall not return unto me void; but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing where unto I send it."

Thus you see that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess, to the glory of God the Father. And says God the Father, in view of this event, surely shall say, "In the Lord have I righteousness and strength, even to him shall men come, and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed."

[Time expired.]



## [MR. POWER'S SIXTEENTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators and the Congregation.*—The gentleman declined closing his affirmative this morning on the ground that he wanted to bring forward considerable additional proof. And we prepared to meet him with any additional proof he might adduce. But we perceive there is no additional labor for us to perform at this time. And we might say as the Indian interpreter did. *Just as before.*

From the course he took yesterday, we brought the charge that he had changed his position. When last up, he said I was mistaken, and that he had not changed his ground, but had only made a little enlargement.

He said that means of grace are to be used in man's salvation, and he brought one additional text to prove that all would confess Christ and be saved. His assumptions are incorrect. He announced that the text quoted, is unconditional. We deny this assertion. "Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth." Now is *looking to the Lord* unconditional? What is the object of their *looking*? It is that they might be saved. This means reformation, turning to the Lord, faith in Jesus Christ, and implies the performance of all the conditions of salvation, on the part of men.

Another assumption is that, bowing the knee, and acknowledging that Jesus is the Lord, is equivalent to all intents and purposes, to holiness of heart and life, and to all the change necessary to prepare for heaven. The assumption is an absurdity. And unless he had been pressed, and led to the necessity of adopting any course, if possible to save his argument, he never would have made it.

Our remarks in reference to the quotation from 1. Cor. and Phil. we leave to the congregation to decide upon as they choose. He quoted again from 1 John. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is Christ is born of God." Now we gave to you before, John's explanation. He gives the infallible standard of proof that a man is born of God. He has faith—that faith which works by love and purifies the

heart, and he keeps the commandments of God. And every one that does not give this evidence, gives proof to the contrary—that he is an enemy to God.

A word or two in reference to Dr. Clarke on the vii. of Rom. I would remind him again, and I do it for his benefit, that he may appear as a disinterested, in the best light before this community;—and you will all probably recollect, that he has announced to us probably about every third speech, his question. Do the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament teach &c. But he has given practical evidence, that the Scriptures as a standard of proof do not answer his purpose. Hence he has recourse to Dr. Clarke. And all he gets by this source is by perverting the Dr's. meaning on the text, The Dr. is speaking of those who believe with a heart unto righteousness, and in reference to all such cases, he rejoices, and says. "The Lord God omnipotent reigneth! Amen! and Amen." But the gentleman perverts the Dr's. meaning here, and would make the impression that he applies this to the whole human race. To show you that the Dr. had no sympathy with the gentleman, I will read a few lines from him. But will however first remark, that I did not come here to prove my position by commentaries, but by the Bible. I have not before departed from this course and should not now; only in justice to the honored dead, in justice to the right criticism, in justice to the memory of a man who is here perverted before this community. The Dr. does not apply this passage to the whole human race. To show you what his views were on this subject, I will read you his comment on Rev. xx. 14. *And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire.* "Death himself is now abolished, and the place for separate spirits no longer needful. All dead bodies and separated souls being rejoined and no more separation of bodies and souls by death to take place, consequently the existence of these things is no farther necessary."

*This is the second death.* "The first death consisted in the separation of the soul from the body for a season, the second death in the separation of body and soul from God forever. The first death is that from which there may be

a resurrection, the second death, is that from which there can be no recovery. By the first, the *body* is *destroyed* during *time*; by the second, *body* and *soul* are destroyed through eternity."

So you see the gentleman has really traduced the reputation of the pious Dr. in making him teach the unconditional salvation of the whole human family.

I do not ask an apology for this departure, for it is to sustain the reputation of an eminent servant of God and of the church.

Again: the gentleman has made a personal allusion to my case. Stating that I cannot be saved in heaven unless I am changed and made better than I am now. But as I will not spend time in mere personalities, I have only to remark on this, that if I perish and go to perdition, it will not alter the truth of God's word.

But the position he takes here is that all orthodox christians maintain, that all persons including the best of christians, live and die in sin, i. e. they have some of the seeds of sin remaining in them till death, and consequently, there must be a change after death, before they can enter heaven; for all must be holy there. Now we think we are authorized, from the knowledge we have of the theological views generally held on this subject, to state that the gentleman is incorrect here. They believe that every believer will be fully saved, and wholly sanctified either before or in the article of death, before they reach the future world, and they depend wholly on the grace of God for their hope of heaven. Hence, his announcement that all orthodox christians take common ground with his system here, is as wide from the truth as the poles.

All protestant denominations so far as I know, depend alone for salvation, on the riches of the infinite grace of God, revealed and made accessible to man, thro' the incarnation, merits, death, and resurrection of Christ. And they believe that salvation is wholly of grace. But while they believe it is of grace, they believe it is wrought in their heart, and that the blood of Christ is applied to their heart, on condition of repentance and faith in Christ in this world, and that they are cleansed either before or in death, by

the infinite grace of God—wholly sanctified and fitted for heaven.

The change that fits for heaven is wrought in the believer's heart by the direct agency of the Holy Spirit, and is wholly a work of grace. And God can effect this work as well before, as at, or in death.

Whenever the individual believes in God with all his heart, he puts on the hope of glory, and the image of God is formed in his heart, and if he holds out faithful, he is sure of eternal life.

These are the views of all Protestant denominations, though we may differ in some minor points. Still on all the vital points, all these denominations agree. While the gentleman's system throws man on the virtue of his own personal suffering for his preparation for heaven. I charge his system with taking away all the means of preparing men for heaven, or for future glory, and all the necessity of his having any means in this life.

To show you that men may be made holy in this life, I read 1 John i. 8, 9. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us *our* sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

But the gentleman says we must wait till the resurrection, before we can be cleansed from all our unrighteousness, and possess perfect moral purity in our hearts. Let us put his statement in one scale and the Apostle's in the other and see which will outweigh. The Apostle says if we confess our sins God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and cleanse us from all unrighteousness. But the gentleman says, if we confess our sins, God is not so faithful and just as to forgive us, and cleanse us, but we must suffer the penalty in full for our sins, and wait for the resurrection to cleanse us. I know his system tries to cover up this position by teaching that "God punishes the sinner but pardons the sin." But this is a glaring absurdity. According to the system, God neither pardons the sin, nor the sinner.

Now, to show you that men are pardoned, and fitted for heaven in this world, we quote 1 John iv. 16, 17. "And

we have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love: and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him." Now what state is a man in, when he dwells in love and in God, and God dwells in him? This is as strong an expression as could be used to show that the believer is at peace with God, and is in the full enjoyment of Divine favor. But where is this enjoyed? The answer is at hand. "Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment: *because as he is, so are we in this world.*" *In this world* we are like Christ. And our love is made perfect in this world, in order that we may have boldness in the day of judgment. Now love is the fulfilling of the law, if then our love is made perfect, the law must be fulfilled in us, and we be rendered pure and fit for heaven, and all this is done in this world. For further proof of this position I quote Phil. iii. 13—15. The Apostle is here speaking of the triumph of grace in this world, in sanctifying the soul, and of the triumph in the future world in raising the bodies of the pious. In reference to the resurrection state, he says. "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but *this* one thing I *do*, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Jesus Christ." But in reference to his attainment in this present mortal state, in reference to his preparation for the future state, he says, "Let us therefore, as many as *be perfect*, be thus minded: and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you." Here you see that the gentleman, and Jehovah speaking through his Apostle, are directly at issue.

The gentleman says there is no one perfect in love, or holy in this life, that there is no perfect love, that there is no freedom from sin before death. But God says "love is perfected in us," and perfect love casteth out fear, and allows the Apostle to speak of himself and others as being *perfect*, and if in anything they were otherwise minded, God should reveal even that unto them. And God says if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just *to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.* But the

gentleman says, "if you sin you must suffer for it, there is no forgiveness—the blood of Christ is of no use to you, the love of God is of no avail to you, there is no principle in the universe to assist you, but you must suffer the penalty for all your sins to the fullest extent—but when you have done this, you may claim heaven through justice alone."

The gentleman made a reference to *means*, he knew if he took the ground that he did not believe in the use of means, he would uncover the head of the serpent, that he would expose some of the true features of his system. For mark, it is a prime object with the advocates of this system, to cover it up as much as possible. They know well if the serpent is seen in its true form without any covering, men will flee from it.

He says, he believes in the use of means. Now I would ask him if he dare to say that he believes means are necessary to man's salvation in heaven, to be used by man in this world. Dare he come out openly and tell us that he believes that God requires of us the use of any means, which if we fail to use we shall be kept out of heaven? I leave this question for the gentleman to answer.

[*Time expired*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S SEVENTEENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen and friends.*—I want to settle this position once for all. Our friend has brought it up to view I believe, almost every time he has occupied the floor since he commenced. He has had much to say about faith and repentance, and obedience, as being necessary conditions of immortal life, as if God had predicated man's state in the future world on some conditions to be performed by the creature in this life. Do you not see that this is the hold to which he has fled. I want to relieve him from the necessity of laboring any more on this point. I remark however that it is wandering from the question, but I am willing to wander a little time, for the sake of relieving my friend from his great labor on this position. The question under discussion has no reference to man's condition in this world—no reference to the benefits flowing from faith and

obedience in this life. Of the utility of faith and obedience on the part of the creature in this life, we perfectly agree with the gentleman. These things are all good and profitable to men here, as Paul says, "Believing we do enter into rest," "believing" says Peter "we rejoice," "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." We believe that repentance and reformation result in most happy consequences. We attach great value to all these qualities and exercises, we give them credit for all the value they possess. We know they are all good and produce good results—present salvation. But remember the gentleman's position is that an immortal and eternal life of holiness, purity and endless enjoyment in the future world, is predicated on faith and repentance, and good works on the part of the creature in the present life. Now I repeat this is not the question under discussion. The question is, will all be holy and happy in *an immortal state of existence*, it is not whether any will be holy or happy here, or whether all are sinners here. But to save the gentleman the trouble of agitating this point any more, I consent to turn aside and settle it. That salvation is not bestowed as a reward for good works, nor as a reward for merit on the part of the creature, the gentleman has conceded. But he contends that these are the conditions of obtaining salvation in heaven. Now I do not concede this, I admit that they are necessary as means of enjoyment in this life, but not as a condition of enjoyment in the future life. Now we have proved that men will possess glory, honor, and immortality in the future world, and be made equal unto the angels, and become the children of God, being children of the resurrection—that they will then possess all the happiness, that love, faith, and obedience can possibly produce, and far more than they can produce in this world, for these cannot cleanse men from all impurity in this life. We have given at least the 11th. edition of this argument and it must still be fresh in your minds, and it will not be necessary for me to go over with all this proof again.

In the future world all will possess all the moral worth that can arise from faith and obedience and all christian graces in this world and much more. For now they are

not cleansed from all moral pollution. But there they are beyond the reach of all moral defilement. And then says the Apostle, "death the last enemy shall be destroyed." Yet our friend has stated and brought Dr. Clarke to prove that death will be eternal. Now what is Dr. Clarke's opinion, when put in the balance against Paul's ? Paul says death shall be destroyed, and we believe Paul. Now I say God has never given us any intimation by his prophets or Apostles, or in any other way, that he has predicated man's future blessedness in a state of immortality on faith and good works on the part of the creature in this life. Now I hope the gentleman will understand it, as I have stated, I have *proved* this repeatedly on this floor. On account of the strong bias in most minds against this position, owing mostly from wrong early training, and being much strengthened by public sentiment. On account of this I say, I have given line upon line, and precept upon precept, that I might if possible bring all to see the glorious truth on this subject. I have proved, that God hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose ; and grace which was given us in "Christ Jesus before the world began." In which purpose, says Dr. Clarke, "God did not consult with Angels, Men, or Devils,—The purpose was wholly his own. He determined to save all men by his grace alone, and not by their works. Salvation, I repeat, is wholly the gift of God. "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God, is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." But still I say all our good works will be rewarded. They constitute present salvation.—They make individuals peaceful and happy in this life, and result in great good to society.

Now, I hope we shall not again hear the gentleman say that we have a system that attaches no importance to faith and good works. For we do attach much importance to them. We say, they constitute a *salvation*. But not eternal salvation—that salvation is the gift of God.

The next thing we wish to notice is the attempt of our friend to avoid, or deny my statement, that the best of Christians are contaminated with sin here; and unless they



experience some other change than that which arises from repentance and good works here, they can never be saved. Well, after a good deal of twisting and turning on this, he comes out and concedes all I wish—and his language, is whether a *lapsus linguae* or not, I cannot say. "Salvation in the future world depends on the grace of God, and the grace God can effect this change, through the agency of the Holy Ghost, as well after death as before." [Mr. Power remarked here, that the gentleman was mistaken.] Let me explain a little to show you how he came to make the statement. He made it in opposition to my position that the resurrection was what completed the change in all men and fitted them for heaven. To show that my position was wrong, if possible, he was led to lay great stress on some other means of purification. And he says it is not the resurrection, but the grace of God that works the change. And he does not deny but that he has some moral pollution about him in this life: But he expects that he will be cleansed by the grace of God, and so powerful is this, that he believes it can effect the change after death as well as before. Well, I believe this as well as the gentleman. I do not limit God's power. I believe it is just as easy for God to purify the soul after death, as it is before. And the gentleman can give no reason from philosophy or reason, why God cannot just as well make a soul, however contaminated with sin, holy and happy after death as before.

You recollect I stated that unless a change, for the better passed on men after death, no one could enter heaven; and that all denominations admitted that all were defiled by sin, and not fit for heaven till death.

What denomination holds a more respectable rank among the religious denominations of the land, than the Presbyterian denomination. And to show you that we have stated their views correctly we will read two or three articles from the Presbyterian confession of faith.

Chapter vi. sec. 5. "This corruption of nature *during this life*, doth remain in those that are *regenerated*, and although it be through Christ, pardoned and sanctified, yet both itself and all the motives thereof, are *truly and pro-*

*perly sin.* Chap. ix. sec. 4. "When God converts a sinner and translates him into a state of *grace*, he freeth him from his natural bondage under sin, and by his *grace* alone enables him freely to will, and to do that which is spiritually good, yet, so that by reason of his remaining *corruption* he doth *not perfectly*, nor *only*, will that which is good, but doeth also that which is *evil*." Chap. xiii. sec. 2. "This sanctification is throughout in the whole man yet *imperfect*; in this life there *abideth still* some remnants of *corruption in every part*, whence arises a continual and irreconcilable *war*, the flesh fighting against the spi it, and the spirit against the flesh."

In connection with this, I give you a short chapter in Paul's experience. "For we know," he said, "that the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, *sold under sin*, for that which I de, I allow not, for what I would, that do I not, but what I hate that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but *sin that dwelleth in me*; for I delight in the law of God after the inward man, but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and *bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members*. O! wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Yet he says, "I keep my body and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be cast away," i. e. lest he should fall from grace. Now this warfare is kept up with the best of men till death, and many who do their best are not able to keep their body under as well as Paul did, for many do fall from grace, as my friend believes. Eternal vigilance is enjoined on christians, lest they let the world, the flesh, and the devil get the victory over them. But with all their watchfulness and care, still on account of being brought into captivity to the law of sin, every one can exclaim with Paul, "O! wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" How, then, are we delivered and saved? It is by the power of the outstretched arm of the Almighty—by the resurrection into the glorious liberty of the children of God—the last crowning act of Almighty power and Grace—being placed be-

yond the reach of sin and suffering—being made equal unto the angels—and children of God, being children of the *resurrection, and not subject to death any more.*

My friends, it is on this ground that man is to be saved, and not by the works of the creature, and I hope our friend Power will not talk any more about the necessity of faith and good works to effect all this. Why, what can a frail creature of a moment do to effect such a stupendous work as the salvation of the soul! Salvation is *all* of grace and not of works.

The gentleman quoted Dr. Clarke, on Rev., as an offset to what he (Clarke) said on the passage in Rom. 5. where he tells us, "death is conquered, hell disappointed, the devil confounded, and sin totally destroyed," and then shouts "Hallelujah! the Lord God omnipotent reigneth! Amen, and Amen"—in prospect of the glorious consummation.

Here, our friend, in order to do away with the Doctor's opinion on this text, which perfectly coincides with our opinion, he quotes his opinion on a passage in Rev. 20th, 14. Now I would say if Dr. Clarke's opinion is of any value on the passage in Rev. it is likewise of equal value on the passage in Romans. I have before stated that Dr. Clarke, when his mind was free from any bias by his creed, or from his early education, when he spoke the unprejudiced sentiments of his mind, preached Universalism, and proclaimed it in as strong terms as could be used.

The gentleman finds fault with my quotation from Isa. xlv, and says it contains a condition, but I say there is no condition. God says, Isa. xlv. 22—24. "Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear—surely shall say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." No condition here. The word has gone out of the mouth of Jehovah and it will not return unto Him void. Now I challenge the gentleman to take hold of these proofs and see if he can weaken them in the least. [*Time expired.*]

[Here, Mr. Doolittle expressed his willingness to close the discussion on the first question, and proposed that after adjournment they should sum up their arguments and take up the second question; stating that he should not probably occupy the whole hour in his closing speech. This proposition was acceded to; and the meeting adjourned.]

[MR. POWER'S SEVENTEENTH and closing speech on the first question: occupying an hour, according to the agreement.]

*Gentlemen Moderators and the Audience.*—I arise on the announcement of my worthy friend, Mr. Doolittle, that he is through with his proof of his affirmative, according to the rules, to make my closing speech.

And the circumstances that occurred just before our adjournment in the forenoon, render it necessary for me to review the gentleman's last speech before I proceed to the summing up of the arguments adduced as counter proof.

The gentleman remarked that the state of man in this world was not the point at issue in the question before us; and that it was merely out of courtesy to me that he gave any attention to the condition of man in this world.

In this he is incorrect. It was a matter decided by the judges, that I had a right, under the rules and the question, to bring counter proof on the negative from the word of God, bearing on the state of man in this world, in reference to his future state. So it was not merely a matter of courtesy to me that he should attend to this point, but it was my right, and what I could demand of him in justice.

Again: under the same principle of courtesy, as the gentleman claimed, he undertook to illustrate the case of men in this state of being. I thank the gentleman for the little attention he gave to this subject. But I will here correct a sentiment attributed to me, viz: that we maintain that man's immortal existence in the future world depends on his faith and obedience in this life. This is altogether a mistake. We announced in the early part of this discussion, in order to correct this erroneous impression,

that man was an immortal being, by the purpose of God, irrespective of his conduct in this world. We have only stated that man's future happiness or misery was suspended on faith and obedience in this world.

But the gentleman felt himself pressed, as indeed he was, to be more explicit on this subject, and he announced clearly that his system teaches the necessity of faith and good works, in order to the enjoyment of peace in this world only, and that they constituted a present salvation, but denied utterly that these conditions of happiness in this life had anything to do with man's happiness or misery in a future state of existence,—he denied that God had given us any intimation, in any way, that man's happiness in the future state was predicated on faith and obedience on the part of man in this life. We thank him for making this statement so clearly; and you all see that it is a full and clear admission, and amounts to the entire charge which we brought against his system, viz: that God releases man from all obligation whatever in this life, as a condition or means of their entering into heaven. We thank the gentleman for thus fairly acknowledging all we had charged against his system in this respect.

He adverted again to man's being equal to the angels in the resurrection. We showed the sophistry of this when he first brought it up. But now merely refer to it again. The sophistry consists in bringing man's moral state in the future world, into the conclusion when it is not contained in the premises. The question the Sadducees asked the Savior, only had reference to man's relative condition in the resurrection state, and in answering this question, the Savior said nothing about the moral condition of man in that state, but said, in respect to their relative condition, "they are equal unto the angels, they neither marry nor are given in marriage." And it is his sophistry alone that brings their moral condition into this question at all. And when this is exposed, all his argument here vanishes away.

He very modestly referred again to the sign. All we have to say to this is, just look over our doors and see where the *twisting and turning* is done.

The next point I notice is, my friend's position in attributing to me an affirmation that I never made, viz: that the grace of God is applied to man in the regeneration and sanctification of his nature, in the future, as well as in the present world. I corrected him at the time, but he persisted in affirming it. My friend, Mr. Doolittle, has the honor of being the only man with whom I have discussed this, or any other subject, that has refused to take my correction in a case of this kind. I have only to deny that I hold any such sentiment, and excuse the gentleman on the ground that he finds it much easier to refute positions which he makes for me, than to meet those which I make myself. Most likely he thought, "If Mr. Power will only let me refute a position I will take for him, I can get along well enough, but if not, I must fail certainly."

His next point was, that no one in this world is fitted for heaven. I cited, when last up, a number of plain Scriptures which show that persons were sanctified wholly, and perfected in love in this life; which he passed over entirely. And I will only add, that Enoch walked with God in holiness, and was translated without tasting death, and so was Elijah—he, in like manner, walked with God; was wholly sanctified in this life and translated without death.

His next effort was to excite a little sympathy in behalf of his system, from our Presbyterian brethren, by harmonizing the sentiments contained in their Confession of Faith with his own, and with his system. I am willing he should get all the sympathy he can, but I have too much confidence in my Presbyterian brethren to suppose they would allow the brotherhood between themselves and his system, which he claims.

The last remark I have to make in review of the gentleman's speech, is respecting his breach with his friend, Dr. Clarke. He appeared to care very little about Dr. Clarke, and finally said that when he was not under the influence of prejudice, he wrote Universalism. But he did not write Universalism all the time. Now if what he says of the Doctor is true, Dr. Clarke, with all his weight of character must have been a hypocrite. And my friend,

according to his account, brings up the testimony of a *hypocrite* as proof on his affirmative.

Now, gentlemen, with these passing remarks that have been made hastily, in view of this being my closing speech, I pass to a brief review of the question that has passed under examination during this discussion.

The question reads:—"Do the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments teach the ultimate holiness and happiness of the entire human race in a state of immortality?"

The point was stated in the first place, that God had made full provision for the final salvation of the entire human family. On this, at least in appearance, we were agreed.

The question then arose, "does God release man from all obligation of duty in this world; such as faith, reformation, love, obedience, or holiness, as necessary to prepare him to enjoy happiness in the future world?" This my opponent was compelled to affirm, and to take the ground of the unconditional salvation of the entire human race. This we denied, and on this point, the issue was joined. The gentleman's true position being, that God releases man from all responsibility of faith or obedience in this world, as a condition or means of salvation in heaven. He would not, at first, frankly acknowledge that this is his position, but did so virtually, and adduced as his strongest proof, the argument of the resurrection in the xvth Chap. of 1st Cor. He informed us more than once, that this was the strongest proof, and if this does not sustain his system, there is no proof under heaven that can.

His main proof from this was: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." He told us that Adam does not mean a literal man, but the earthly constitution of all men. We replied, that, unless he violated all rules of sound interpretation, and used one part of the text figuratively and the other literally, he could derive no proof from this text. And if he gave a figurative interpretation to both parts, as he must, if he gave it to one part, then he rejected Christ from the world as a literal being, and made him only a constitutional, undefined, and undefinable Christ. The gentleman has never met

this objection, and it remains against him still in all its force.

Another point in his proof from the resurrection, was: "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory. This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." The congregation can not have forgotten his insuperable difficulty on this point, on which his entire system relies for support. I showed that if he applied the text to the soul, he must take the ground that the soul is *mortal*. There is no avoiding this. But he forestalled himself, by saying he believed in the immortality of the soul. I gave him the liberty to retract if he chose, but he dare not do it, for fear of farther disclosures. So this stands against him in all its force. We have challenged him more than a half dozen times to meet this, but he has not touched it. I repeat, that if he applies this text to the soul, then he must maintain the mortality of the soul, and come out a Materialist; yea, an Atheist. The gentleman left it then, and there it remains as the eternal rock. And if I had not adduced another particle of counter proof, this alone would annihilate and stand as an eternal refutation of his system.

The gentleman then adduced some other proof for to strengthen somewhat, his main proof, which he said was sufficient without any other; and from the numerous editions he gave us of it, we should be led to suppose that he, at least, thought it was sufficient. All his additional proof we examined. And you will recollect that we asked him if we had passed by a single text without examination. And he signified that we had not. But that we had not met them as he wished us to do.

This, all will recollect, that yesterday, in the afternoon, and this morning, the gentleman, feeling the difficulty that he was in, and seeing the distress of his system, virtually abandoned his first position, notwithstanding his disclaimer to the contrary; and hence if the sign was over our door yesterday, as intimated, he has taken it away and nailed it over his own. No one will forget, that in the first argument he adduced—and he repeated the same



a great number of times—staked his entire system on the absolute power of God exerted in the resurrection. But he has now changed his ground entirely—virtually acknowledging that his system cannot be sustained by such evidence; and takes the ground that all men are saved by the grace of God, in regeneration. It is clear to a demonstration, if we are fitted for heaven by regeneration, or any thing else, it is not by the resurrection.

We have now reviewed the positions the gentleman took; and now pass to glance at some of the counter proof which we advanced.

1st. We brought proof from the word of God, to show that He has not made man's future and eternal destiny to depend on the resurrection merely. 1. We showed that *faith in this world*, is a condition of eternal life; and quoted among others this text.—“He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” We have showed that *everlasting life* was the highest blessing that God promises to man in this, or the future world, and that it is inseparably connected with faith in this world. This counter proof rose with resistless force against all the gentleman could adduce on his affirmative. He glanced at it without attempting to refute the position. 2. We advanced another class of Scriptures to show that men were required to reform—to break off from their sins by righteousness, and to evince a thorough reformation of conduct in this life, as a condition and means of future happiness in heaven; but the gentleman never looked at this. All must recollect his perfect silence on this point. 3. We showed that God had connected man's future and eternal destiny inseparably with the regeneration of his heart, by the Holy Spirit in this state of being, in this world, and his supreme love to God. But he never condescended to notice this part of our counter proof. 4. We showed that holiness of heart in this life, is an indispensable condition of enjoying the favor of God in the future life. “Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.”

We showed conclusively that there was no way by

which men can be made partakers of God's holiness, but by repentance, reformation, faith and obedience, which result in the regeneration of the heart, by the direct agency of the Holy Spirit, and in the entire sanctification of their nature,—And all this takes place in this world. And we challenged the gentleman to produce one solitary text to prove that any of these things took place in the future world. But the text was not adduced, and our proof remains untouched.

2d. We then showed that the system we oppose announces to man, that they may disbelieve the Bible, disbelieve in Jesus Christ,—may reject every truth of God revealed to man,—may reject the very existence of God himself, live and die in the most stubborn unbelief, in the darkest and most corrupt Atheism, and yet be as unconditionally sure of heaven as if they were now wearing a crown of glory. This the system holds in direct opposition, as we have shown, to what God requires of men in this life, that they believe in Him—in Jesus Christ—and in His revealed word, as condition and means of holiness, and happiness in the future and endless world. And we challenged the gentleman to deny this charge—but did he do it? No, verily! You are witnesses that he did not.

3d. In opposition to what we proved from the Bible, that God required of men in this life, in order to enjoy future happiness in heaven, we showed that Universalism maintains that God does *not* require man to repent and reform in this life as a condition of happiness in the future world; but, that it tells men that they may live in falsehood, in perjury, in blasphemy, in seduction, in adultery, in piracy and robbery, in infidelity and idolatry, and all manner of wickedness, and then terminate their own life, and rush into eternity with this moral character; and yet be unconditionally sure of heaven.

4. In opposition to what we proved from the declarations of Scripture—that love to God and man, and holiness of heart in this life, are conditions of enjoying the favor of God in the future world, we proved that the system we oppose maintains, and announces to men “You not only need not *love* God, but you may *hate* him with all your

heart, mind and strength,—you may hate man with equal malignity of heart, and you may live in all the moral degradation and pollution of sin, and yet you are absolutely certain of being received into the highest favor of God in the future world, and of enjoying his blessing throughout eternity." We challenged the gentleman to deny this, but he could not.

We showed in our counter proof that Universalism rejects Jesus Christ to all intents and purposes, as a Savior.

The gentleman staked his whole system on the power exerted in the resurrection. Now the Bible teaches that Jesus Christ is to raise the dead. And the system maintains that Jesus Christ is a finite being. So on the gentleman's own ground, if we were to admit the soundness of his position,—that the resurrection is to effect all the change necessary to fit men for heaven,—for he admitted that Christ is the agent to raise the dead, we showed that he plunged himself into an inextricable difficulty here; for nothing short of Almighty power can raise the dead. And then we proved under a second head—that he had to delegate omnipotent power to Jesus Christ, to enable him to raise the dead. And the very moment that God should, if it were possible, delegate his omnipotence to another, he would cease himself to be omnipotent, and cease to be God, and the world would be involved in absolute Atheism. This the gentleman did not even attempt to meet.

Again: to show that the gentleman's system does reject Jesus Christ, in his life, death, resurrection, and in all his characteristics as a Savior, and that it is the worst form of infidelity. We showed that Jesus Christ must save men from future punishment, or from the commission of sin in this life, or from the punishment of sin in this life. But our worthy friend said that men were never exposed to punishment in the future world, consequently, Jesus Christ could not save them from a punishment they were never exposed to. Does he save men from sin in this world? No, there are too many lamentable evidences to the contrary, for any one to take this ground. Then there is but one way left in which Christ can be a Savior of man, and that is from the punishment of sin in this world. Does

Christ save men from the punishment of sin in this world ! The gentleman says no. For he has told us repeatedly in this discussion that men are to be punished for every sin to its fullest desert in this world. Consequently, we have shown that Universalism does reject, to all intents and purposes, the Lord Jesus Christ, as a Savior, in every feature of his character. And my friends; lest I might possibly be mistaken, and it should not be a system of such gross infidelity as I have represented. I gave the gentleman liberty to get all the help he could from his friends, and I have kept the system in this view, all the time before you, that it might be taken up at any time, and disposed of if possible ; but the gentleman as you all see, has left his system to languish and expire under these accumulated calamities.

We demonstrated that the system, the gentleman maintains, could not be proved from the Bible,—that it contradicts the Bible. The Bible teaches that Jesus Christ holds the keys of heaven and hell. But his system maintains that men have these keys in their own hands. It maintains that it is perfectly optional with men whether they remain in hell in this world, for there is none elsewhere, or go to heaven,—that they may go to heaven just when they please. If men are tormented in this place of punishment here and wish to get out, they can just turn the bolt with the key they have in their own hands. *i. e.* they may commit suicide and they are sure of heaven.

Again, we showed in addition to this, that in opposition to the Bible, this system offered the highest reward for the most daring wickedness that could be committed in this world. You will recollect our explanation of the term reward. In proof of this, we quoted from the 55th Ps. "bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days." Thus if a man were to live soberly, piously, and godly, he would live on to the common age of man, or twice as long in this world of affliction and pains and sorrow, as the bloody and deceitful man. For the bloody and deceitful man, in consequence of his hypocrisy, and murder, and wickedness of all kinds, would not live out half his days—he would leave this world of trouble and mis-

ery and go home to heaven, to the enjoyment of the special presence of God.

7. Here gentleman, judges I remarked in the conclusion of my counter proof: that a system that turned men loose in the world, free from all moral restraint, or obligation to God or man, with reference to their eternal destiny, a system that challenged men to employ all their powers both physical and mental, in all the crimes and iniquity possible for men to commit, and they could not in the least endanger their salvation in heaven—that put in the hands of men the keys of heaven and hell, and put in their hands the highest reward for the most daring crimes under heaven. I remarked that that system could not be proved to be the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments.

But the gentleman's affirmative holds all this. Therefore the Scripture of the Old and New Testament do not sustain the affirmative of the question before us.

I will close my remarks with adverting to the charges the gentleman has brought against me several times. I have said that his *system* teaches men, that they may cast off all restraint, and go on in all manner of wickedness, and do suicides, and yet be unconditionally sure of heaven. He chooses to have it, that I charge their preachers with teaching this doctrine from the pulpit. And charges me with falsehood and slander, for making this charge. Now I am thankful that so much of this system has been developed before this community—that it has been shown that Universalist preachers dare not preach their whole system. They designedly cover it up. But as to the charge of falsehood and slander, I leave this community to judge.

And when Mr. Doolittle comes to Laporte to preach, if he does not preach what we have shown to be his true doctrine, I leave you to decide in what attitude he stands before you. And what I say of my friend, I say of all his brethern in the same work. When they cover up the vital principle of their system, I leave you to decide on their motives and character.

I have not occupied all my time, I have a few moments left but will waive the use of them, feeling as far as my du-

ty in presenting the negative of this question is concerned, I have discharged it at least faithfully and honestly.

[Time expired.]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S EIGHTEENTH, AND CLOSING SPEECH ON THE FIRST QUESTION.]

*My Friends.*—I would gladly put on that charity that suffereth long and is kind, which thinketh no evil, and is not easily provoked; but I believe there may be such a thing as a stretch of this. I cannot, for the life of me, with all my charity, give my friend credit for all the sincerity he claims, in his sweeping charge he has brought against me. In relation to these charges, however, as the glove was thrown down and the challenge accepted by my friend Loring, I will give him over without the benefit of clergy to him, to be dealt with as he sees fit.

But we will say, if his conscience does not condemn him for his false statements, which he has so often repeated, his moral sense must be very much blunted.

While the gentleman was making his charges, with so much zeal, I could not help thinking of the declaration of the Apostle about those who oppose the truth. That they spoke evil of the things they did not understand; that they were spots and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings; wells without water; clouds carried about with the tempest, speaking great swelling words of vanity; raging waves of the sea foaming out their own shame. I could not help thinking how well this garment fitted our friend Power. Now, Michael when contending with the adversary, dare not bring a railing accusation against him, but said, the "Lord rebuke thee." So I simply say, the Lord rebuke thee, friend Power, and forgive thee, for I verily believe thou hast sinned against light and knowledge. For our friend cannot be ignorant of our principles, having held eight or ten controversies of several days each time, with some of the strong advocates of our system, who laid before him the true doctrines which we hold. And hence, when he comes before you and makes such sweeping charges as

these, that we tell men they may steal, rob, murder, &c., and finally commit suicide, and yet be sure of heaven; and that we promise them the brightest reward for so doing, he knows he says that which is utterly false. There is not a man in the house, who is intelligent, and has any information on this matter, who does not know that these statements are false.

I come now to the summing up of my arguments; and I do not design to detain you long.

1st. You will recollect that thus far, my motive has been to sustain this position, viz: that all rational and moral beings, who compose the entire human race in this world, will, in the immortal state of being, be holy and happy, and saved with an everlasting salvation. And my first argument on this point was predicated on the glorious doctrine of the resurrection of all man to a state of incorruption and glory, and immortality, through our Lord Jesus Christ. And my friend has repeatedly charged me with denying that the salvation of man was effected through Jesus Christ; and predicated it on a mysterious, undefinable something. And, in his last speech, said that I had not attempted to touch this point, when I had repeatedly showed you the falsity of it. We showed that this glorious change would be effected through Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world.

With respect to this argument of the resurrection, you will all remember that our friend taxed all his powers and ingenuity, and skill in evasion, to show that the change effected in the resurrection, was only a physical change, affecting the body only, and has no reference to the moral condition of the soul in a state of immortality. And consequently, the sinner who lives and dies in his sins, though his body may be raised immortal and pure, yet the soul, connected with this pure body, may be as corrupt as it ever was before death. Now our position was just the reverse of this—that when the whole intelligent creation of God shall be clothed upon with immortality and incorruption, that they will not be there with pure bodies without souls to inhabit them, but that their souls will partake of the same nature of their glorified bodies,

and that soul and body, in connection, shall be free from sin and pollution. And to show you that the change, wrought at this time, is such as we have described, we quoted this language: "The creature itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." And as farther confirmation, I cited you to the declaration of the Apostle: "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory. With this song of glorious triumph, "O! death, where is thy sting? O! grave, where is thy victory?" Now will immortal bodies, without souls, thus shout the song of triumph, in this manner? Remember, our friend says this change is confined to the body. But are there no souls here in connection with these bodies? It is folly to deny it. And to show still more conclusively that this is a moral change, Paul adds: "The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." This shows, most clearly, that this change is both moral and physical. Again: the fact is further confirmed by the Apostle in this chapter, for he contrasts man's state in this life with what it shall be in a future life, in reference to this he says: "As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," and, "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ, shall all be made alive." Now from the same death which all die in Adam, all shall be made alive in Christ. Hence, says the eminent Albert Barnes, in his notes on this chapter, "If we grant that this death in Adam is a moral death, and that from such a death, all are made alive in Christ, we throw into the hands of Universalists an argument that is irrefutable." And did not our friend subscribe to this—"In Adam's fall we sinned all," that all were born with a corrupt nature in consequence of the sin of Adam? Hence, as Mr. Barnes says he throws into our hands an irrefutable argument. And I would say that we had this argument whether he is willing to put it into our hands or not.



What has the gentleman done toward taking hold of these strong arguments? If he has grappled with them at all, it is with an infant's grasp. He took this chain on his anvil and struck it with his hammer, and all that he found was one crooked link, according to his own account of it, and that he could not break; the chain, therefore, remains whole.

And further: why did he not take hold on this expression of Paul, "O! death, where is thy sting? O! grave, where is thy victory. The sting of death is sin, but the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ," and show that this did not prove a resurrection of the soul to purity and peace, as well as the body.

Again: how does he dispose of Christ's answer to the Sadducees? He says, "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage."—This, our friend says, has reference to their physical relations. But is this all that Christ says about them in this state? Hear him. "Neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God being the children of the resurrection." What language can more fully express their moral condition in the future world, and that all that are raised in the resurrection will be holy and happy? And yet our friend tells us that the greater part of these will be subject to eternal misery, in a state of immortality.

The argument drawn from the resurrection is plain to all, and our friend sees it, but he wants to get round it, but this he cannot do. I told him in the start, that this argument should haunt him during this discussion, and I mean it shall.

My friend accused me, when ever I attempted to bring any other argument but this, of turning a somerset, of abandoning my position, as if I could bring no other argument in addition to this, without abandoning it? I told you that I was willing to rest my argument on this alone for support. But we have other arguments as strong as holy writ can make them, besides this.

2nd. The next argument I brought forward, was that predicated upon the sovereign will and purpose of God; showing that it was God's will and purpose that all men shall be saved, and that his purpose can never be set aside. On this I quoted Ephes. i. 8—10. "Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth." The phrase here used, according to Prof. Stuart, is a strong expression to denote the whole intelligent universe, who will be gathered together in Christ. Therefore, God, who worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will, and who does his will in the armies of heaven, and whose arm, when stretched out, no power can turn back, has proclaimed that it is his will to bring back to Christ every son and daughter of Adam.

What did our friend Power do with this argument?—Nothing. It still remains against him in all its force.

3d. Our next argument was predicated on Romans v. Here we are informed that *all* are sinners. "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, *for that all have sinned*," "But not as the offence," he says, "so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift. For judgment was by one to the condemnation." The antithesis is kept up all through here, making it as plain as language can make it,—and this is the strongest way possible to express it, that the gift is as great as the offence, that all who are condemned on account of sin, which includes the whole human race, shall be justified through Jesus Christ. "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Therefore,

by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many (the same *many*) be made righteous. That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." "The reign of grace shall be as extensive as the reign of sin, as Dr. Adam Clarke says, "and death is conquered, hell is disappointed, the devil confounded, and sin destroyed;" and then he shouts "Halleluiah! the Lord God omnipotent reigneth! Amen, and Amen." And we shouted Amen, and called upon our friend Power to shout Amen.

4th. Our next argument was predicated on the testimony of Paul, as recorded in Phil. ii. 9—11. "Wherefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* under the earth; and *that* every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

This submission to Christ was to be brought about by the Holy Ghost, and it proves universal submission to his government. And parallel to this is the passage in Isa. xlv. 23, "I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely shall say in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." And this declaration of Jehovah is absolute; it has no condition.

5. Again: we pointed you to the final consummation of the matter, as revealed to the Revelator on the Isle of Patmos, recorded in the 5th Chap. of Revelations. "And I beheld," says he, "and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; Saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and

glory, and blessing." But remember this was not Universalism. This *might* all be and still only the doctrine of our Methodist friends be true. But revelation does not stop here, it goes farther, and what does he next see and hear? "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, *be* unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever." Now this *may* include all living creatures, but it is impossible to restrict it to any thing less than *all rational creatures*.

Now if these arguments and these Scriptures, and many more which we might adduce, do not prove our position, then no argument or testimony brought from the Bible can prove any doctrine whatever. All these arguments have been made so plain, that every individual of common understanding must see their force, and admit that they cannot be destroyed.

Our friend tells us that we put no dependence on faith and good works. But with respect to these charges, I told you I would leave him to our friend Loring.

I tell you that we do believe that reformation, faith, and good works, are all attended with good consequences. But we do not believe that God has fixed man's immortal destiny on any thing that he can perform here. Man's immortal destiny is controlled by a higher power. We shall be saved in a state of immortality through Jesus Christ *by the grace of God*, and not by our good works.

With these remarks I leave the matter with you. And I hope that you may be enabled to treasure up in good and honest hearts, the testimony we have adduced, and give it all that serious consideration it deserves. I do not want you to take my saying on this subject as the truth without examination. Nor to believe all my friend's assertions without examination. He has often tried to lead me from the subject, but never for more than five minutes at a time have I left my main point. And I have frequently reminded my friend of his wandering, but have not been able to keep him to the question. But I hope now as we change the subject, he will keep more to the point.

Here the Moderators announced to the audience that the disputants would take up for investigation the following question :

*"Do the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament teach that any portion of the human race will suffer endless misery in a state of immortality."*

Mr. Power will affirm and Mr. Doolittle will deny.

[MR. POWER'S FIRST SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen, Moderators and the Audience.*—I arise to commence my remarks on the second question proposed for investigation in this debate; on which I hold the affirmative. And will make a few general remarks before we take up the question particularly. And first I will impose no duty on you to restrain my worthy opponent from attacking my views from any point he sees fit, or by any arguments, or proof drawn from the sacred records. I throw open the whole field without any restraint. Secondly, as I observed in the commencement of the discussion, that I did not, on the invitation of my Universalist friend come here merely for display of empty declamation, or for theological speculation, but in the fear of God, to make this investigation profitable to this congregation. I have been governed by this principle thus far, and shall still be, as I have to answer at the bar of God.

We shall therefore undertake to establish on the authority of the word of God, that he as sovereign of the universe, has established a perfect system of moral government,—and that men by obeying, or rebelling against this government, decide their destiny for this and for the future world. In establishing this position, we will endeavor to show that God will fix the case of men for eternity according to their moral character: and that such as avail themselves of the provisions of the Gospel, and possess that moral character that God requires of all his creatures, will be the subjects of eternal life in heaven: And that those who disregard the provisions of God's moral Government and persist in the violation of His commands through life, and enter eternity in this state, will have no change effect-

ed in their moral character after death, and will be the subjects of endless misery in the eternal world.

This is the general ground that we intend to occupy during the discussion of this question. We make this proposition—God is an infinite being; infinite in all his attributes and perfections; and is revealed to the world under the glorious distinction of Father, Word, and Holy Spirit; and that in view of all facts and contingencies connected with all *time* and *eternity*, He saw fit to create man an intelligent subject of a moral government, and establish such a government, and require man to conform to it.

The gentleman, we presume, will not dispute this proposition. If he does, he will have to contend that man is not a subject of moral government—and must meet all the consequences following such an assumption.

Farther under this head, the infinite wisdom of God, has placed man under a moral government precisely adapted to his condition, in all circumstances, and in all his relations, both to man and his Maker. Mr. D. we apprehend will not deny this.

Man as a subject of this moral government under which infinite wisdom has placed him, has revealed in the Bible, all the duties, means, and conditions to be observed, to secure to him the favor of his Maker.

My friend has conceded that the Bible holds out the claim of God for obedience on the part of man in this world, hence it only remains for me to prove that this claim for obedience involves man's condition in the future world.

We mean to name the points specifically throughout this discussion, on which the arguments are to bear, and intend to keep them prominent, so that the gentleman will have no difficulty in understanding them.

The point now to be proved is, that the Government of God, which requires men to obey, as revealed in the Bible, involves his future condition as well as the present. In proof we quote Matt. vi. 19, 20. This is a declaration of God, enjoining man's duty and interest. And we cite it to prove that those duties have reference to man's end-

less condition, and therefore God's claims, involve man's condition in this and in the future world. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steel." This declaration contrasts man's interests on earth, with his interests in heaven; and this is a specific revelation of God to man, as a principle to govern his faith and practice. It proves that man is, by the grace of God to lay up for himself treasures for the eternal world, in opposition to the transitory character of earth and earthly objects.

Here man's future destiny is taken into the account, and his responsibility and agency are brought to view, and required by the Almighty, with reference to his future endless state.

For the same object, we cite Rom. vi. 21—23. "What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death. But now being made free from sin, and become servants of God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. For the wages of sin is death: but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Here it is shown that God's plan of government, and administration toward men, includes the necessity of holiness—being made free from sin; and that the result of this on the part of man is everlasting life. This life commences here and extends into the eternal world.

That you may see how man attains this freedom from sin; and that you may recognize his responsibility in this case, and see that it has reference to this eternal condition, we refer to Titus ii. 11—15. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, *in this present world*; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of

good works. These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee." Here the only condition on which men may be freed from sin, and prepared for everlasting life,—for this has special reference to man's future destiny—is, that they deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and live soberly and righteously, and godly in this present world.

Again: 2 Cor. iv. 1-6. "Therefore, seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not; But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty; not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but, by manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them. For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." We read from the same chapter, explanatory of the provisions and requirements of the gospel,—mark this is the teaching of the gospel. The last three verses show that this has reference to our eternal destiny. "For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward *man* is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding *and* eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen, for the things which are seen *are* temporal; but the things which are not seen *are* eternal." You see with reference to the character of the righteous, that God's claim commences on him in this world, and extends to and involve his condition in the future world.

We now proceed to show that the same doctrine is taught with reference to the unbeliever, the ungodly, that the claims of God rest upon him in this and the future world, and that his conduct here has an influence on his



future destiny. Let us keep in view the point—that we are adducing proof from the Bible to show that God's moral government holds man responsible in the future world for his conduct in this world.

On this point we quote, Matth. x. 27, 28, "What I tell you in darkness, *that* speak ye in light, and what ye hear in the ear, *that* preach ye upon the house tops. And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

The application of this text is that it includes, first the condition of the body through life, and at death, and also, the condition of the soul after death, and teaches that if it leaves the body without the proper character, it is to be destroyed in an endless hell. Again: Matth. xii. 31, 32, "Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy *against* the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come."

This is the declaration of Jesus, with reference to God's moral claim on man, including his obligation to obedience through life, and showing that in this world he fixes his destiny for the future world.

Those who blaspheme the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven in this world, nor in the future world. The gentleman may tell us perhaps that *this world* means the Jewish dispensation, and the *world to come* means the Christian dispensation. But no sound criticism can make this passage mean thus. Moreover, Mark explains it. Mark, iii. 28, 29, "Verily, I say unto you, all sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies whosoever they shall blaspheme: But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." Here during precisely the same length of time that the promise of life is to be enjoined by the believer, it is said that the blasphemer against the Holy Ghost shall not have forgiveness. He that

believeth is made free from sin by the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit, and has life *eternal* in heaven. But he that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost, shall live just as long, excluded from the presence of God and from heaven,—he is in danger of *eternal* damnation. For farther proof, see Mark ix. 43—48. When the Redeemer proclaimed that those who do not cast off from themselves those things that offend—their sins; are in danger of being cast into hell, into the fire that shall never be quenched.

The last passage I shall quote in proof of this fact, that God's moral government, requires of men duties in this life which involve their destiny in the future world, is Heb. ix. 27. "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." In this state of being God holds men responsible to his government. And this text teaches that after they leave this world, God brings them before his bar, to fix their destiny according to the moral character with which they enter the future world:

We have here presented two classes of Scripture. And they are only specimens of a cloud of witnesses which the word of God furnishes on each of these heads, recognizing man's moral accountability in the world to come for his conduct in this life, and that man's moral character in the future world, on God's plan, is formed in this state of being. The righteous while on earth may lay-up treasures in heaven, where they will be enduring. And their light afflictions in this life, work out for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, in the future world. And there they will be saved, and enjoy the favor of God forever, as a consequence of their love and obedience in this life. But those who live in unbelief, and in hatred to God, and in blasphemy in this life, shall never have forgiveness, but are in danger of eternal damnation. We remark again, that we have not cited this passage to prove the length or duration of the happiness or misery of man in the future world, but the fact that God holds man responsible in the world to come, for his conduct in the present world. [*Time expired.*]

## [MR. DOOLITTLE'S FIRST REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators and the Audience.*—I hope, that during the remainder of this discussion, you will not, for a moment, lose sight of the point raised on the question which has been announced. The question is not whether men are to be punished in this world for sin—this I do not deny—but will any portion of the human race suffer endless punishment in a state of immortality. It devolves on our friend to prove, from the Bible, that a portion will suffer *endless* misery, and we to disprove this, and show that the Scriptures do not teach such a doctrine. And I now pledge myself to examine all his important testimony with the closest scrutiny, I design not to pass over a single text. For we are all equally interested in this matter, and if the Scriptures do teach such a doctrine as our friend affirms they do, we all wish to know it.

That man is a subject of God's moral government here, and will be hereafter, and that God's government extends over all beings, I perfectly admit.

The first passage the gentleman quoted, was from Matth. vi. 19—20. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures, &c." Now I would ask what proof is here furnished that a part of the human race will suffer endless punishment in a state of immortality? It is the last passage that I should have thought of, and has no reference, as I can see to the question before us, therefore, I let it pass. The next text was from Rom. vi. 21—23. But this, like the first, says nothing about endless punishment. There is something said about everlasting life, which we believe in, but nothing is said about endless misery. This, then, furnishes no proof. The next text was from Titus ii. 11—15. This teaches that it is the object of Christ to purify men, and prepare them for the blessed hope and glorious appearing which they were looking for. But this is no proof of endless misery.

Again: he quoted 2d Cor. iv. 1—6. This passage requires a little looking to, not because it contains any proof, but because many have overlooked its meaning.

"But if our Gospel be hid," says the Apostle, "it is hid to them that are lost." Mark, it says it is hid from them that *are* lost in the present tense. Now, who are lost, and in what sense are they lost? Why those are lost to whom the Gospel is not preached. The Gospel had been preached to some, while they were walking in dishonesty, in sin and darkness, and they had turned to the light. But some to whom the Gospel had been preached did not believe. It was hid to them, and they were still in darkness. In this sense they were <sup>lost</sup>lost. But does this text say, they are to be lost eternally? and punished forever in the immortal and future world? By no means. And mark you, it was the *lost* that Christ came to seek and to save, it was those from whom the Gospel was hid, that he came to save. Now, if our friend will show that Christ will not find those he came to seek and save, then we will allow that this is good proof for him, but not before.

The next passage is found in Matth. x. 27, 28. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Now, suppose for the sake of the argument, that we admit that these words are to be taken in a strict literal sense,—do they prove the endless punishment of any portion of the human race in a state of immortality? The literal construction of this text, will prove the annihilation of some, but it will not prove their endless preservation in punishment—it proves the annihilation of both soul and body? But will our friend contend for this literal construction? And if we say that the body only is to be destroyed in hell, which amounts to annihilation, then only the soul would exist to be punished. Now the gentleman will not admit this, because it would rob him of all his glory with respect to this text, for he brings it forward to prove that some will be punished eternally, both soul and body. All can see the absurdity of giving this passage a literal interpretation. But I present another difficulty still. The gentleman has admitted that all men, the entire human race, would be raised to a state of immortality, and would possess immortal and incorruptible bodies.

Now, can these bodies be subject to destruction? Impossible, in the nature of things; because God cannot destroy what is immortal and incorruptible. Again: here is another difficulty, even admitting that God has the power to annihilate both soul and body, which must result from the literal construction of this passage, does it follow that he will thus exercise this power? Has He ever revealed to us that it is His pleasure or purpose to annihilate the soul and body? All the text says is, "Fear Him which is *able*," who has *power* "to destroy both soul and body in hell." It does not affirm that He will do it.

But many difficulties will cluster around this passage, and here is another, *hell* does not mean a place in the future world. The word here translated hell, is *Gehenna*. Dr. Adam Clarke explains the use of this term, as employed in Matth. v. 22. "It is composed of two words," he says, "first taken from the Hebrew, *Ghi Hinnom*. It means the valley of the son of Hinnom, a place south of Jerusalem, formerly used for those abominable sacrifices in which the idolatrous Jews had caused their children to pass through the fire to Molock." So you can see that this term used here, does not mean a place in the future world, and that this passage has no reference at all to the future world. You will be satisfied when you understand the object of the Savior's discourse here. He was warning his disciples to fear the earthly tribunals, and those who were seeking to destroy them. And he would especially warn them to fear the highest power, the *Sanhedrim*, for they had power, not only to take their lives, but to condemn their bodies to be burnt in *Gehenna*, or to burn them alive, destroying both the soul (or animal life, which the term rendered soul here means,) and body in *Gehenna*, *hell*. Dr. Clarke tells us there were, according to the Jewish religion and laws, three kinds of offences, which excelled each other in degrees of guilt. For the first, the judgment; the council of *twenty-three*, could inflict the punishment of *strangling*; second, the *Sanhedrim*, or great council, could inflict the punishment of *stoning*; and for the third offence, they could condemn them to be *burnt alive* in the valley of the son of Hinnom. The power that

could burn them in the valley of the son of Hinnom, the Savior warned his disciples especially to fear. This is the meaning of the text, and all it refers to. It has no reference to the future world. And I challenge the gentleman and all christendom, to show that the words generally translated hell, in the Bible; originally had reference to a local place of punishment beyond the grave. This challenge has been repeatedly made before now, but the authorities have never been exhibited, and for a very good reason, they are not to be found.

The next text quoted was from Mark, iii. 28, 29, concerning the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Now if the phrases, *this world*, and *the world to come*, mean what we generally understand them to mean, i. e. if *this world* means the earth, on which we dwell, and *the world to come* means the eternal world, and if this passage means those who blaspheme are never to be forgiven while they live on this earth, nor in the immortal state after death—then our friend makes out something from this passage. But unfortunately for him, these phrases mean no such thing. And here as a parallel passage, with reference to the same subject, I wish to read Dr. Clarke's comments, which perfectly accord with my views. I quote him because he expresses just what I believe on this subject, and then you hear his views in connection with mine, Matt. xii. 32. I read a part of his remarks on the phrase. *Neither in this world. Neither in the world to come.* "Though" he says, "I follow the common translation, yet I am fully satisfied the meaning of the words are, neither in this dispensation, (viz the Jewish,) nor in that which is to come, viz. the Christian." *Olam ha-bo*, [Hebrew words,] the world to come, is a constant phrase for the times of the Messiah, in the Jewish writers. The sin here spoken of by our Lord, ranks high in the catalogue of *presumptuous sins*, for which there was no forgiveness under the Mosaic dispensation, see Num. xv. 30, 31, and xxxv. 31, Lev. xx. 10, Sam. ii. 25. When our Lord says that such a sin hath no forgiveness, is he not to be understood as meaning that the crime shall be punished under the Christian dispensation, as it was under the Jewish, viz. by the dea-

truction of the body. And is not this the same mentioned 1 John i. 7, called the *sin unto death* i. e. a sin that was to be punished by the death of the body, while mercy might be extended to the soul. The punishment of presumptuous sins, under the Jewish law, to which our Lord evidently alludes certainly did not extend to the *damnation of the soul* though the body was destroyed; therefore I think that though there was no such forgiveness to be extended to this crime, as to absolve the man from the punishment of *temporal* death yet *on repentance* mercy might be extended to the soul, and every sin may be repented of under the Gospel dispensation. Now this is a rational criticism, and with him several Orthodox commentators perfectly agree. Now for the gentleman to make out any thing from this text it will devolve on him to show that it proves that the blasphemer's soul will be punished eternally. [Time expired.]

[MR. POWER'S SECOND SPEECH.]

[This speech, and the one following, occupy but fifteen minutes each.]

*Gentlemen Moderators* :—First, we remind you, as named specifically when we introduced this subject, that the proof we adduced was to establish the point, that God's system of moral government involved man's interests in this and in the future world. That it promises happiness to the obedient, which he cannot fully enjoy in this state of being; and threatens misery to the disobedient, which he cannot fully experience in this world. This is the point under consideration. The gentleman, as we are aware, would like to have us confined to a very narrow compass. But we remind you of the practical character of this discussion, that we desire to make it profitable, and not to confine it to mere abstract speculations.

He seems to make peace again with Dr. Clarke. But, we shall pay but little attention to any other authority, than the Bible. And his going to the Dr., shows that he feels the need of help.

Mr. D., in his remarks on Matt. x. 27, 28, says, if the

text be taken literally, it would prove annihilation, and this we would not wish to have it prove. He need not fear. We do not intend to prove annihilation. He says the term translated *hell* here, originally meant the valley of the son of Hinnom, south of Jerusalem. This may be true ; but the word had come to mean, and the Jews so understood it, in the time of Christ, the place of punishment for the wicked in the future world. This he will not deny. And we have, too, the authority of his friend, Dr. Clarke, on this.

Now, the Savior knew that the Jews so understood this term ; and we have no instance recorded that He ever charged them with error, or attempted to correct their opinion on this point, but that He used it, knowing that they did so understand the term, and would take Him to mean the place of punishment in the future world.

Our friend said, "many difficulties cluster around this passage." And so he will find, as we proceed.

The term *gehenna*, (hell,) was understood by the Jews to be the place of future punishment, and this doctrine of theirs was endorsed by the Lord Jesus Christ. This, if he has any knowledge of the history of that age, he cannot deny.

But he made a mistake here, that is fatal to his position. He said the Redeemer had just been exhorting his disciples to fear the persecution of the higher authorities among the Jews ; those tribunals that could take their life, and especially that tribunal that could burn their bodies, after death, in the valley of the son of Hinnom. But this is a palpable mistake. It is just the reverse of the fact. The Savior, truly, had been speaking of the persecutions to which the disciples would be subjected ; but does he exhort them to fear their persecutors ? No,—“Fear them not,” is his exhortation. But He tells them whom they are to fear—Him, who had power to assign the finally impenitent to a region of hopeless misery. Instead of telling us to fear men, the Bible expressly tells us not to fear men. God says, “the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom,” and “the fear of man bringeth a snare.” Christ then would warn them not to fear the rage of men,



for all they could do would be to kill the body ; but to fear the object of all christians' fear and worship, Him who is able to, and will, administer his government faithfully, and reward all the righteous, but punish all the finally impenitent in hell.

Another difficulty into which my friend has fallen, is, that the *soul* here means the *animal life*, and not the immortal spirit of man. Well, according to this, the Redeemer says, "fear not them which can kill the *body*—(does not this include the animal life?)—but fear some power that can destroy the *animal life*." Here you see that the gentleman, in trying to avoid my application of the text, has fallen into a real absurdity. We would like to know what that *animal life* is, that can be destroyed after the body is dead? Perhaps our friend can inform us? But this is not the only difficulty he is involved in. He must confine his position here to the strictly literal interpretation of the passage, or he must allow its figurative signification. He may take just which he pleases. If he takes it figuratively, he yields all we wish. But if he understands it strictly in its literal sense, then the text can have no reference to any person on earth, except those who lived when the fire was literally burning in the valley, and can have nothing to do with any one in the present generation. [15 Minutes expired.]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S SECOND REPLY.]

Now, while your attention is on this passage about the destruction of the soul and body, I want to convince you, my friends, that it is some other power besides the God and Father of our spirits, that the Savior is warning his disciples to fear. All has reference to the Jewish tribunals, and this is evident from the language. And here I will read several verses in connection, and let you be your own judges on the language. I say it shows that God was not the one to be feared. "And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake, but he that endureth to the end shall be saved. But when they persecute in this city, flee ye into another, for verily I say unto you, ye shall not have

gone over the cities of Israel, until the son of man be come. The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his Lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his Lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household? Fear them not, therefore, for there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, and hid that shall not be known. What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light, and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye on the house tops. And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." And now, to show you more particularly that the Savior does not warn them here to fear God, he adds: "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. *Fear ye not therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows.*"

Here the Savior tells them in plain language, not to fear their heavenly Father. Now, would he tell them almost with the same breath, to fear Him? Here we *know* he is speaking of God, and he expressly tells his disciples not to fear Him. But when he says, "rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell," he uses no appellation to signify that he means the Father; and from what he says immediately after, that they should not fear the Father, we must be led to conclude that the former passage has no reference to the Father, but to some other power—to the *Sanhedrim*. To this power they would be particularly obnoxious; and they were to fear them. For this power could condemn them to be burned in Tophet, as the worst of malefactors—a most disgraceful death. Here I would have my friend Power mark, that the word here rendered *soul*, is not the word generally rendered *spirit*. It is the same word that is rendered *life*, in the 39th verse of this chapter. "He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that looseth his life shall find it." Here, without any doubt, it means animal life. And so it does in the last under consideration.

Now the Sanhedrim had power not only to hang or stone an individual till dead—till animal life was extinct—but power to destroy both life and body in Gehenna, the place where condemned malefactors, convicted of the highest crimes, were burnt alive. This is the power and this the death, which they were warned to fear—but they were not warned to fear God—for he who cared for the sparrows, would most certainly care for them who were of more value than many sparrows. Now this is the true and common sense illustration of this text. And it does not teach the monstrous doctrine of the endless misery of any portion of the human family, in a state of immortality.

I will now bring up one of the exceeding great and precious promises, which has reference to the final destiny of all men. The promise was made to Abraham and the Patriarchs, that in them and in their seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed. Gen. xii. 3: "And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee, and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." This is repeated in the 18 c. 18 v., and 28 c. 14 v., and in other places. This covenant is likewise referred to in Acts iii. 25. "Ye are the children of the prophets and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." Now all commentators agree that this is a promise of blessings through Christ, to all nations. But what is the nature of God's promised blessings? Peter tells us, Acts iii. 26, "Unto you first God having raised up his Son Jesus, and hath sent him to bless you, *in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.*"

Again, to show that this promise includes both Jews and Gentiles—Gal. iii. 8, "And the Scriptures, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." Now, my friends, if you will find, or if my friend Power will find, a single individual that is not included in *all nations*, and all families, and all kindred, I will admit that there are some that will not be saved. [*Time expired.*]

SATURDAY, AUGUST 2—9 O'CLOCK, A. M.

## [MR. POWER'S THIRD SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Judges, and the Congregation.*—I arise this morning to resume the investigation of this important subject, viz: the future final destiny of mankind. We will just name the points now under consideration.

You will recollect that our first proposition is, that God's plan of moral government, as revealed in the Bible, holds man responsible in the future world, for his conduct in this world. And that this government promises rewards to the righteous that cannot be fully enjoyed in this state of being, and threatens privation and misery to the finally impenitent, that cannot be fully experienced in this life.

We have adduced Scripture proof of this point, on a part of which the gentleman offered his comments last evening. Before proceeding to apply these texts, we make a few remarks on our friend's last speech; which, no doubt, was observed by all to be something of a curiosity. One thing of which he informed us in it, is, that the Scriptures do not teach men to fear God. That they are to fear those who can kill the body, but not to fear God. [Mr. Doolittle here requested the privilege of making a correction. He said his position was, not that the Bible did not in other cases teach us to fear God, but that that passage taught no such thing.] I thank the gentleman for his explanation. And in this I have the advantage of him, for in several instances he refused to take my explanation as my true meaning.

We notice another point—destroying the soul and body in hell. He takes the position that the *soul and body* mean the physical nature—the body, and the animal life, the soul—and that this includes all that is spoken of in the text—that nothing is said about the immortal soul. We showed the difficulty on this; that it teaches us not to fear them that can kill the body, but that power that can, after

killing the body, destroy the animal life. And we asked him to show us an individual that, after its body was killed, had animal life left to be yet destroyed. But he has not produced any such creature.

The point was in reference to *gehenna*.

We stated the difficulty that he might take it literally or figuratively, just as he pleased. If literally, then the text has no reference to any power under heaven, except those who lived when there was a literal fire burning in the valley of the son of Hinnom. And this will release all men of the present day from any obligations to the Gospel. If figuratively, then all his argument falls to the ground.

In his last speech, he made a rush to the general promises of the Bible; which he claimed as being counter proof on the point under consideration, while they belong appropriately and necessarily to his affirmative. But he had not moral courage, or was deterred, from some consideration, from using them there, while in the open field of contest, and he has saved them for a running shot. But as he named his texts so rapidly that we could not take them down, and as he made no direct application of them, we will pass them at this time without remarks.

We resume the argument to prove that God's system of moral government threatens men with privation and misery which they cannot be subjected to fully in this world, and that of absolute necessity it extends to the future world. We are not now proving the duration of this misery; but that God does threaten men with this misery. We will show in the next place the only condition on which men can avoid this misery; and then show its duration.

We have some fears that we will, this morning, be the innocent occasion of a quarrel between friends. We regret this, and would not take such a course but from conviction of duty. It is the more painful to cause this falling out, on account of the ardent friendship which my friend, Mr. Doolittle, has evinced for Dr. Clarke, whom he considers one of the most talented, learned and critical scholars of the 18th and 19th centuries. But the fault is not mine. We quoted Matt. x. 27, 28, to prove the point

under consideration, that some are punished both soul and body in hell; i. e. after death they are punished in the future world. We have maintained that "he who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" is the great Jehovah. And will on this read a few words from Dr. Adam Clarke's commentary. "It is not," says he, "*hell fire* we are to fear, but it is *God*; without the stroke of whose justice, *hell* itself would be no *punishment*; and whose *frown* would render *heaven* itself *insupportable*." Here we have the unequivocal testimony of our friend's tried and competent witness. And he must make the Dr. a hypocrite by teaching one thing at one time, and the opposite at another time, to suit his convenience, or he must yield the point. If the Dr. gives false testimony on one point, he is not to be believed at all.

Now, the Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, Matth. xii. 31, 32. Here we give you again the testimony of our friend's competent witness. He says, "Even personal reproaches, revilings, persecutions, against Christ, were remissible; but blasphemy, or impious speaking, against the Holy Spirit, was to have no forgiveness."

On this point, too, Dr. Clarke gives the views of Dr. Lightfoot, who quotes the Jewish Rabbi to show that the phrase *the world to come*, means *the state after death*.—"Thus," he says, "*Rab. Taneum*, The world to come, is when a man has departed out of this world." The Jews understood the phrase to mean two things—"the times of the Messiah," and "*the state after death*." Hence, so far from Dr. Clarke's views conflicting with our position, they come directly to its support.

I refer to these distinguished divines, not because they prove or disprove my affirmation, but to save Dr. Clarke from gross perversion.

Again, in proof, Luke xvi. 19—31. The rich man and Lazarus. On this passage we will again introduce our friend's competent witness, Dr. Clarke. I shall not read all he says, but just enough to give you his views on it. Verse 19, "There was a certain rich man." "In the *scolia* of some MSS. the name of this person is said to be *Ninive*. This account of the *rich man* and *Lazarus*, is

either a *parable* or a *real history*. If it be a *parable* it is what *may be*: if it be a *history* it is that which *has been*. Either, a man *may* live as here described, and go to perdition when he dies: or some *have* lived in this way, and are now suffering the torments of an eternal fire. The account is equally instructive, in whichever of these lights it is viewed."

"By the phrase *Abraham's bosom*," he says, "an allusion is made to the custom of Jewish feasts, when three persons reclining on their left elbows on a couch, the person whose head came near the breast of the other, was said to *lie in his bosom*. So it is said of the beloved disciple, John xiii. 25. *Abraham's bosom* was a phrase used among the Jews to signify the paradise of God. See Josephus' account of the Maccabees, chap. xiii." [*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S THIRD REPLY.]

*Gentlemen, Moderators and the Audience*—It appears that our friend Power and myself are verily at issue again this morning. And the first thing of importance I shall notice is, his calling to your recollection again what he termed a very strong proof of his position. He again referred you for proof to Matth. x, 27, 28. Now I want to have you pay particular attention to this text, and give it all the weight you can in justice, in proof of our friends position, but if on a candid and careful examination of it, you shall be satisfied that it affords not the least shadow of proof on his side, admit this also.

I showed yesterday that the enquiry was, what are we to understand by the term *hell* in the text? Our friend tells us that it means a place of endless punishment beyond the grave, I stated that in the text it had no such signification. But that it was a term composed of two words *Ghi Hinnom* and meant the valley of the son of Hinnom on the south of Jerusalem. To make this term mean a place of punishment in the future world is an utter perversion of the original meaning of the word. In proof of this I read you Dr. Clarke's explanation of the term in Matth. v. 12, for the same word in the original, is used in both

instances. From the fact that fires were kept constantly burning in this valley to consume dead bodies and whatever offensive was left there, the phrase arose "where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched." You see my friends from the very definition of this term translated *hell* that it cannot mean a place of punishment in the future world. And I have challenged the gentleman or any one else to bring forward from the Bible a single word which in its primary signification meant a place of punishment in the future world. But no such word has, or ever can be found.

Again, what are we to understand by the destruction of the soul and body as mentioned in Matth. x. 27, 28? Our friend contends that the *soul* here means, the rational and immortal spirit. But we have shown that this is not the meaning. The term rendered *soul* here is the same in the original, as the one rendered *life*, where our Savior says, "He that findeth his life, shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake, shall find it." "And how our translators should render this term *soul* in one place and *life* in another place" says Dr. Clarke "I cannot conceive." It is plain then that this word *soul* in this place does mean the *animal life*, and not the *immortal spirit*. Now I wish to have you bear in mind this definition of the meaning of the term *soul* here, and we will enquire what is meant by *destroying both soul and body in hell, Gehenna*, and *who have power to do this*? "And fear not them which kill the body," those minor authorities which have power only to take the life—but fear him—that power or tribunal that has not only power to kill the body—to destroy the animal life, but to burn the body in Gehenna. Now mark these were minor authorities that had no power over the bodies after the life was taken, they had power to condemn the individual to be stoned to death, to be strangled to death, or to take his life in any manner whereby the animal life might be destroyed. But here was a power that could burn the body—destroy both soul and body in this Gehenna hell. There are powers among us that can destroy the animal life. They can hang up a culprit, and there let him rest. And in addition, they



can give over the body to the surgeons for dissection. So there is a destruction of both the animal life and of the body. Well thus it was with respect to the Sanhedrim, they had power not only to destroy the animal life, but to burn the body in the valley of the son of Hinnom. Such my friends is the meaning of the text, it has no reference to the condition of the immortal spirit in the future world.

But our friend here would have Dr. Clarke and me at war with each other. He says that he regrets that he is going to set good friends at variance. He contends that Clarke does not accord with me, on my explanation of the phrases *this world*, and *the world to come*. But I will show you he does fully accord with me, and that he clearly shows from his definitions of the terms employed in this text and which is confirmed by the most eminent biblical critics in the world—that the text offers no support to our friends position.

Our Savior first says: "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men," but here is a peculiar kind of blasphemy that shall not be forgiven, for a length of time,—neither in this world, nor the world to come. Our friend would have the phrase, *the world to come* mean the eternal world. But Dr. Clarke says "Though I follow the common translation, yet I am fully satisfied the meaning of the words is, neither in this dispensation (viz. the Jewish,) nor in that which is to come, (viz. the Christian.) *Olam ha-bo*—the world to come is a constant phrase for the times of the Messiah in the Jewish writers." To prove that this phrase was so used, he quotes from Dr. Lightfoot. I wish you to mark that we do not contend, that there was absolutely no forgiveness for this sin under the Jewish dispensation. Only that the Jewish law would not absolve a man for this sin—he must suffer the death of the body although the mercy of God might be extended to the soul.

When our Savior says, this sin shall not be forgiven in *this world*, he has reference to the Jewish law, which always punished this crime with death.

This is its meaning, and this is all it means. It has reference only to the body, or to the penalty of the Jew-

ish law, which must be inflicted on the body, while mercy might be extended to the soul.

So you see it fails altogether of giving our friend the least support in favor of his position.

The next important position our friend took, is one which I think will give him considerable trouble. And I want him to tread here as if he was on slippery places, and in order that he may step safely, I want him to define his position which he takes on this point. Now I ask him and want a definite answer, which of the two positions of Dr. Clarke he takes respecting the account of the *rich man* and *Lazarus*, whether he understands it as a *parable* or a *real history*. I want a definite answer. [Mr. Power, "*Gentlemen Moderators*, there is great danger of spoiling children by granting their wants unconditionally. I now propose that I will answer every question the gentleman chooses to ask me during this discussion, directly, yes—or no, with the privilege of having three minutes to explain, if I am misunderstood: provided that he will agree to answer in the same manner, any question I choose to ask him. If not I will not spoil the child by granting his request."]

I will do this, provided I can answer all his questions. For he may ask me questions that I cannot answer. Even a child can propose questions that a philosopher cannot answer. [Mr. Power here repeated the proposition that it might be understood by all] I now repeat the question with fewer words, whether he understands the Scripture to be a *parable* or a *literal matter of fact*? [Mr. Power answered, "A literal matter of fact."] Well, I hope our friend will not back out of that position. As I have but a few moments of time now, I want you to bear this answer in mind, and the next time I am up I will attend to it.

I will now call your attention to the same counter proofs which I brought forward in my last speech, which my friend did not attend to. These are recorded in Gen. iii. 15. and xii. 3, and xxvi. 4, and xxviii. 14; and in Acts iii. 25. I quote these promises, my friends, as the foundation of the Gospel promises. These were given to

Abraham and confirmed to Isaac and Jacob. And, according to Peter's interpretation, they are the substance of all the promises revealed through the prophets, that God would bless all the families, nations, and kindred of the earth—which promise I understand to be a *universal salvation* to all the nations of the earth. And for our friend to make his argument good, he must show that there is some individual, at least, that is not included in *all nations, families, and kindred of the earth*. But as they do include *all*, and here blessings are bestowed on all, through Christ, the promised seed, and the blessing is defined—"in turning away every one of you from his iniquities," it results in the complete redemption of the whole human family, and their salvation in heaven. Dr. Clarke informs us that this salvation means a salvation from sin, and that Peter means to teach that this promise—that all the nations of the earth should be blessed in the seed of Abraham—is the main promise contained in all the prophecies, and in the whole of the Old Testament, relative to the kingdom of Christ on earth, the whole reign of grace from his ascension till his coming again; till the reign of sin should be destroyed, and all things be restored to their primitive order, and the peace of God, which passes all understanding, keep the heart and mind in the knowledge and love of God, and that the Scriptures teach that this work shall be *universal*.

This settles the question. And now we want the gentleman to walk up to this proof and see if he can refute it. For as it stands, it entirely nullifies his position. For if it be a promise that includes eternal life, as Dr. Clarke understands it, and it undoubtedly does, and embraces the whole human family, every individual of it, then we have proved from the Bible, that all will be saved in heaven. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S FOURTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators.*—In the commencement of this address, we will attend to the last item in the gentleman's

speech, viz: the promises of general, or universal blessings. And first, a word with regard to Dr. Clarke. Mr. D.'s remarks would make the impression that Dr. Clarke maintains, that these promises secure the *unconditional* salvation of the whole human family. This is not correct. Dr. Clarke's views are that these promises contain God's plan of mercy and grace through Jesus Christ, which *provides salvation* for the whole human race; and that every one who, by repentance and holy living, avails himself of these promises, shall enjoy them in a future world; but every one who rejects them shall be endlessly miserable. This is to rescue Dr. Clarke from the repeated perversions of his views in this discussion. And all can see that the gentleman's case is desperate, or it would not lead him to do such palpable injustice to an author of established reputation for honesty and piety.

The promise was made to Abraham, and renewed to Isaac and Jacob, and referred to by Peter, that in the seed of Abraham all the nations of the earth should be blessed. This is the promise which constitutes the promise in the argument. And the gentleman's conclusion is, that all will absolutely be saved in the heavenly world. This conclusion we deny, to all intents and purposes, and affirm the argument to be entirely sophistical. And until he proves from the word of God, that to be blessed in any sense, is synonymous with absolute and unconditional salvation in heaven, he has not the least shadow of support from this source.

It appears that he intended to take us by surprise, in his mode of operation. We have already apprized you that he had not the courage to bring out his ammunition in the open field of conflict, where it ought to have appeared, but that he saved it for a running shot. Yesterday morning, when it was proposed to close the first question, he informed us that he had a great amount of new proof he wished to bring forward, and consequently we continued the discussion. But he spent the whole forenoon in referring again to his old argument, bringing only one additional text. And now, since we have commenced the second question, he brings forward his proof for me to rebut. But

we know the system like a book, and understood the mode of warfare of its advocates! and we knew that the gentleman's ammunition was about used up in the open field; and the question with him was, whether he should use it all in the last shot, or save it for an ambush. And the latter was his conclusion. And yesterday afternoon he rushed from his ambuscade, as if to take us by storm. But we are acquainted with the manner of attack, and are not thrown into any perturbation by it; but remain,

“*As calm as summer evenings be,*”

Notwithstanding this new mode of operation.

We now turn to the gentleman's proof. The blessing promised, he *assumes* to be *unconditional salvation* in heaven. We will produce a few facts to show the falsity of this, and wish you to judge between *facts* and *sophistical assumptions*. If every nation, and kindred, and people on the earth, are the subjects of this blessing, then it follows that not an individual has ever been passed by. Well, as a specimen, first we will take the Jews, and see if every individual of them was fully blessed in this sense. We cite you to 1 Cor. x. 7, 8, where the apostle informs us, in reference to the Jews, that for idolatry and fornication, there fell in one day, three-and-twenty thousand. And it is said in Heb. iii. that their carcasses fell in the wilderness, on account of their *unbelief*. And the Savior says, Mark xvi. 16, “he that *believeth not* shall be *damned*.” Now here are twenty-three thousand who had the promise of this blessing, that, under God's judgment, were hurried, in unbelief, instantly into eternity.

Take another instance—the British army at the battle of New Orleans, in the last war. It is reported that the commander-in-chief of the army, with certainty of success in his undertaking, promised the soldiery, if they would storm the city they should be turned loose upon the spoil, and especially the females should be given into their hands as a reward of their bravery. And they rushed to the conflict. But through the overruling hand of Divine Providence, in giving success to the American army,

ranks were mowed down, and they were hurried instant into eternity, with all their lusts and crimes living in their hearts.

Let me give another example. France, when Infidelity had its standard, and the Bible was condemned and

When the ministers of God were openly murdered, his temple desecrated, and made the house of lewdness and crime. When the Sabbath was blotted out, and Liberty, Atheism, murder, adultery, and all crimes, had full reign. During this reign of moral death, hundreds and thousands of the most abandoned and wicked of mankind were hurried into eternity, in a moment of time without any warning.

Now, Gentlemen Moderators—for we mean to dislodge this gentleman from his ambush entirely—we have added, from three different nations, cases that were hurried instantly into the future world, while their hearts full of unbelief, opposition and hatred to God, and living with lust and brutal crimes, and cherishing the worst Atheism. Mark my proposition—that God threatens men with privation and misery that cannot be fully experienced in this life. And we call your attention again

to the gentleman's first proof, the climax of his proof, in the former part of this discussion, which is—that none of corruption is to be removed till the resurrection. He has taken every thing on the resurrection, which is yet to come. Granting all he wants from the resurrection, which is yet future, here are thousands of idolatrous Jews, who have been hurried into eternity, with all their sins living upon them; and thousands of the British army, who were shot down in an instant, while lust was burning in their hearts; and thousands upon thousands of the French army, that left this world, full of adultery, murder and blasphemy, and entered upon their existence in the future world with this moral character. Hence, according to his argument, they are unholy till the resurrection. Or, at any rate, he must take one of three positions. 1st. That they come out of this world wholly sanctified and fit for heaven. But he dares not do; for he must deny the Bible, and his own arguments already given to us. Or, 2d. He must

take the ground that they are in a state of unconscious sleep till the resurrection, which is no less a renunciation of the Bible. Or, 3d. He must take them to heaven in an unholy state, which, if possible, is still worse. Please weigh these *facts*, against a bare *assumption*.

The gentleman has contended that men cannot be changed and fitted for heaven till the resurrection, when the mediatorial reign of Jesus Christ shall cease. And now he can see that he has difficulties accumulating on his hands. We leave him to grapple with them, and pass to notice his remarks on our former position. He still persists in saying that it was not *God* that the Savior warned his disciples to fear in Matt. x. 27, 28. I will not stop to use argument to refute this feeble attempt at evasion. And will only say, that if you commence at the 16th verse of this chap. you will see that the Savior enumerates many things that they would have to endure, and tells them that they should be hated of all men; but then in reference to those that could inflict all manner of violence on their *bodies*, he says to his disciples, *Fear them not therefore*. But he tells them whom they might fear—Him who, in addition to all that might be done to the body, could destroy the immortal spirit in hell—in the future world—for this is the meaning. I have read Dr. Clarke to show you that he holds that it is Jehovah whom we are here taught to fear.

A word with respect to the rich man and Lazarus. We answered the gentleman's inquiry, that we understood this to be a literal matter of fact. But we will here remark, that as some of these facts refer to this world, and some of them to the future world, the nature of the case requires that some of the language should be figurative. All such important *facts* recorded in the Bible, are described to us in figurative language. But because figurative language is used, that does not show that the scene described is not a literal matter of fact. [*Time expired.*]

## [MR. DOOLITTLE'S FOURTH REPLY.]

Our friend Power would have you believe that we have adopted the ancient mode of warfare, but we discard that style of fighting altogether. Our motto has always been, *an open field and fair play*. This ambushing we do not hold to. Give us the open field and light, that we may know what standard we rally around. But I always supposed it was the privilege of the negative party to bring up any counter proofs he could, against the affirmative. And, in this matter, in quoting these promises, I have only been following in the footsteps of my illustrious predecessor in the former part of this discussion. [Mr. Power here remarked, that he had not said what he had in the character of complaint, and renewed his statement, that he was willing that his system should be attacked at any point.] Well, then, I hope we shall not here any more about any old manner of warfare. I know he dreads my fire from this quarter, but he must stay and take it, and I warn him that I have a good many shots to make yet.

I now call your attention again, to the promise to Abraham. Our friend here has labored very eloquently for our hero of New Orleans, and to show that some nation, away back in antiquity, had not inherited this promise, and hence, some of the nations, at least, may suffer endless punishment after all. Now I want to set this matter right, then we will proceed. But first bear in mind the fact, the blessing promised, is universal, including all the kindred, families, and nations of the earth. Then, as this universal promise is a promise of salvation, it embraces the salvation of the entire human race. And I will say, that the whole argument of my friend went in my favor. For the promise *will be fulfilled*, and he showed it was not fulfilled in this world. Hence, the necessity of having it extend to the future world. This blessing is referred to in Gal. iii. 18. "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ."—"That is," says Dr. Clarke, "justification, or the pardon of sin, with all other blessings consequent on it; such as *peace with God, spiritual life, and eternal glory*;" and sur-



ther remarks that, "God gave the law that the exceeding sinfulness of sin might appear, and that man might be prepared to welcome the *Gospel* which proclaimed *salvation to a lost world*, through the atoning passion and death of Jesus Christ."

Now, my friends, here are promises, and these promises are the Gospel covenant made with Abraham, and with his seed, that all nations should be blessed through Christ, the Messiah. The promise extends from the beginning to the end of the reign of Christ. All the blessings are to be bestowed before he yields up all things into the hands of his Father. Christ will destroy the last enemy, the whole matter will be accomplished, then he will yield up all into the hands of the Father, that God may be all in all. Then all will, according to this promise, have their sins pardoned, be at peace with God, possess eternal life and glory, with all its happy consequences.

We now invite your attention to the memorable case of the *rich man* and *Lazarus*. Remember, our friend has answered definitely, that he understands this as a literal matter of fact. Understanding it in this sense, I have simply to observe that it affords not the least support to his position. It renders the whole a ridiculous farce, and so far from supporting his position, overthrows it altogether.

*A literal matter of fact.* Hence, we are to understand that at a certain period of time, there lived, as a literal matter of fact, a certain rich man, clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day. And, as a literal matter of fact, there lived at the same time, a beggar, named Lazarus, that he was full of sores, and the dogs licked his sores, and he died. And, as a literal matter of fact, he was carried, bodily, into Abraham's bosom. Now, how many literal bodies of beggars could be contained in Abraham's bosom? But this is only one difficulty; and mark, he was not buried, but carried directly into Abraham's bosom, by angels. And the rich man also died, and was in hell, as a literal matter of fact. Then, as a literal matter of fact, there are two such places, as *heaven* and *hell*, so near each other that conver-

sation can be carried on between the inhabitants of the different places. And as a literal matter of fact, there is a desire on the part of those in hell, to go to heaven, and a desire of those in heaven to go hell. Then, as this rich man got into this literal hell, he desired that Lazarus might be sent to dip the tip of his finger in water and cool his tongue. What a request for a man in his situation! Would this be any relief to him? No! but an aggravation. There would be some consistency if he had called for an ocean of water. Again: and he said, "I pray thee, therefore, father." This, my friends, is a literal matter of fact. Then, hell is a place for a prayer meeting! Christ says, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." But here in hell, prayers are put up, really for the overthrow of its kingdom. And if hell is a place for prayers, for the conversion of sinners, it overthrows the gentleman's position entirely. Now, my friends, you see the consequences of understanding this in a literal sense, and if it affords my friend any support, he is welcome to it. It is probable that we shall have a new edition of it when he arises next time. Till then we let it pass.

Now for some more ambush fighting, we have some more ammunition yet, and we shall trouble our friend in this way as often as we can conveniently, after attending well to his proof texts. 1st John, iv. 14. "And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world." Here Christ is denominated *the Savior of the world*. Now if he is the Savior of the world, then the world will be saved. If not—if John was laboring under a great mistake—then the world will not be saved. If our friend will show that Christ is not the Savior of the world, then we will conclude that some may be lost. Now, you will all grant that Christ cannot be the Savior of more than he saves. For example—to illustrate—I stand by the river side, I see ten of my friends in a small boat, it is upset, and they are now struggling in the water, I launch out to their rescue—my object is to save the ten—but I succeed in rescuing only five, the other five are drowned. Now can I be called the savior of the ten? No; only of the five whom I saved.—

Hence, I say, Christ cannot be the Savior of more than he saves, and unless he saves the world he cannot be denominated the Savior of the world.

But I will give the gentleman another argument. John, Chap. vi. 37. and xii. 32. The argument here is, that God has given all power into the hands of Christ, so that he can say, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." We hold that this teaches the salvation of all men. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S FIFTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Judges.*—A few remarks on the gentleman's counter proof. And he is reminded that he is at liberty to adduce proof from any source he chooses, and bring it to bear against any position we may take. But I shall not feel bound to attend to any text unless he gives chapter and verse, and read it that it may be taken down.

He holds that the universal blessings refer to the future world. This position I deny, and before he can avail himself of the argument, he must establish his premises; that these blessings mean, unconditional salvation in the future world. We maintain the contrary and to illustrate, quote Rom. v. 18. "Therefore as by the offence of one;" referring to the apostasy of Adam, by whose sins he and his entire posterity fell, and the condemnation of God's law—"judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." That is, Jesus Christ by his personal obedience in this life, and by his vicarious suffering and death, has so satisfied the law, that every member of the human family may by repentance and faith in Christ, be justified, sanctified and saved. This is the universal salvation that is promised, and it has reference to what God has done through the gift and vicarious suffering of the Lord Jesus Christ. Without this God could not from the perfections of his own nature, save a single member of the human family—justice would not be satisfied. But by reason of this vicarious atonement, he can save every child of Adam from every nation, and kindred.

and tongue, provided they will accept of the terms of salvation. And this he has promised to do. But if they live in voluntary wickedness, and refuse the offer of mercy, and die in their iniquity, they must endure the penalty of the law in the future world. So the *assumption* that this blessedness belongs *unconditionally*, to every individual of our race in the *future* world, is false in all its parts, and in every element that enters into it—absolutely false. And the word of God fixes FALSEHOOD on its brow.

We have shown that through the righteousness of one *i. e.* through the vicarious and meritorious sufferings of Jesus Christ, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. That is in infancy all are born into this world in a state of justification and dying in this state are saved. And in this respect, all the nations and families and kindreds of earth are blessed in accordance with the promise. But that all who come to adult life, or to years of understanding, and have sinned, can never be saved but by faith, In further proof, we read Rom. iii. 23—26. "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith [mark the condition *through faith*] in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

Now you see we have removed the whole basis on which our friend rests the whole catalogue of promises.—And have showed conclusively, that instead of these promising *unconditional* salvation to adults, either in this or the future world, salvation is suspended wholly on faith—believing in Jesus Christ in *this world*. And that those who do not believe cannot be saved, either in this or the world to come.

A few words more in reference to the general blessings. We have brought to bear against the gentleman's *assumptions*, a number of stubborn *facts*, and we might increase the list if it were necessary. All these had been the sub-

jects of this blessing when they entered this world, and had by their wickedness forfeited the favor of God. These persons, whose characters and crimes have been described, were hurried into eternity in a moment, under the frowns of an offended God. They entered into the future world unholy—unprepared for heaven, and fit subjects for perdition and endless woe. We showed that the gentleman must either take the ground that they went out of the world holy—and this he would not do, for he has already forestalled himself in saying that no one, not even Paul himself, leaves this world holy, and that all must wait for the resurrection to purify them and fit them for heaven—or that they are in a state of unconsciousness till the resurrection—or that they are still in a conscious state and unholy.

Now to settle this point in the answers given, I ask the gentleman, under the rule we have agreed upon, to answer any question, yes, or no, with the privilege of three minutes to explain—Did these persons go into eternity holy or unholy? [Mr. Doolittle answered—“As far as all the light and evidence we can get enables us to determine, they went out of this world unholy.”] Well, I ask the gentleman, in the next place, if he believes they went into heaven in that unholy and corrupt state? [Mr. Doolittle—“I do not.”] Again, I ask if he believes they have a conscious existence till the resurrection? [Mr. Doolittle—“As to that we have no ocular demonstration.”] I require a direct answer. [Mr. Doolittle—“My opinion—to accommodate my friend—merely my opinion is, that those individuals are in a conscious state of existence.”] Now I ask him if he believes that this conscious existence is a state of happiness or of suffering? [Mr. Doolittle—“That depends on circumstances, if—”] I ask not a speech or explanation, but an answer, yes, or no. [Mr. Doolittle here positively refused to answer this question, claiming that it came under the condition he had made, this being a question that could not be answered.] The gentleman says he made a condition, and this question comes under it. I simply remark, and then yield the floor for adjournment, that I readily concede to his reservation not to answer a

question that is impossible to answer—but the point is, does this question come under this head? Those who left this world in the state described, he admits, were unholy, that they could not enter heaven in that state, that they are in a state of conscious existence, and now the last question is simply this—are those persons happy or miserable? I leave it to the congregation to decide, whether this comes under his reservation, or not. [*Adjourned.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S FIFTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators and the Audience.*—I do not want you to forget the question now under discussion, and I will read again. [Question read.] You will bear in mind that this question is not whether men are punished for their sins in this world, but will they suffer endless punishment in a state of immortality? You remember I brought forward, in confirmation of the negative, the promises made to Abraham and renewed to Isaac and Jacob, which promises are the Gospel covenant made with these Patriarchs, embracing the spiritual interests and destiny of all moral beings. These promises are promises of Universal Blessings, to be bestowed on all the families, kindreds, and nations of the earth, through Jesus Christ. The nature of the blessings, we contended, were salvation from sin; as Peter explains it, in Acts iii. 25, 26—“Ye are the children of the Prophets and of the covenant which God made with our Fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first, God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, *in turning away every one of you from his iniquities*”—This renders it evident that the nature of these promises, is salvation from sin. You recollect that I told you they extended through the whole mediatorial reign of Christ—and then he surrenders up the Kingdom to the Father, that He may become all in all. He will then have fulfilled these promises, in turning away every one of our race from his iniquities. “And then cometh the end,” as Paul says, and the last enemy shall be destroyed, and all shall be redeemed from the bondage of corruption into the glorious

liberty of the children of God, and become equal to the angels, and be the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.

Now what does our friend Power say to this? He admits it is a universal promise, and a universal blessing.—We agree in this. We both believe that it is a promise of a Savior and Redeemer of this world. But what is the nature of this salvation? In what sense is Christ the Savior of the world? This is a salvation from sin. And Jesus Christ saves all men, and turns them away from their iniquities, and renders them through his agency immortal, glorious, holy and happy in the future world. Christ came into the world to make full atonement for the transgression of Adam and all its consequences. And in this sense he fulfilled the promise. This is so expressed in the M. E. Discipline. It reads thus, I think. I quote from memory: "The atonement by Christ is a perfect, full and complete satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." [For correct reading, see Discipline, Art. 2.] Now we believe that Christ has made a universal atonement and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and that this constitutes him the Savior of the world. Now I have the curiosity to enquire, what farther claim justice can have, than full satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual? In this sense, my friend admits that Christ is a universal Savior—that he has made full satisfaction for all sin. But after all, strange to relate! he will tell you, a great part of the human family will be made eternally miserable in the future world. This looks to me like demanding payment for the debt twice. After full satisfaction has been made for all sin, then *again* demand satisfaction for it at the hand of the transgressor! But perhaps he can explain this, and make it perfectly reconcilable with Scripture and reason.

My friend finds fault with my exposition of the passage in Rom. v. But this scripture is one of the most lucid arguments, in proof of the universal salvation of the whole human family, to be found, except the argument from the resurrection. Indeed, it is full as clear as that, but not

quite so strong. But is strong enough to prove the doctrine fully. The Apostle is here laboring to convince those to whom he is writing, that the evils of the fall of Adam, or of sin which reigns over all, are to be entirely removed—that the reign of sin shall be destroyed, and the Kingdom of Grace succeed in its place, and every moral malady be removed, and all be restored to spiritual soundness and moral health, that the remedy shall be as great as the disease. That you may be satisfied that this is the feature of the argument, let Paul speak himself, 18th verse: “Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men; to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.” The Apostle is here speaking of what had not been actually experienced by every individual, (for all have not yet been justified,) but what would be experienced; and for greater certainty, as he often does, he uses the past tense. Now remember, that by the offence of one, *all* have come under condemnation. And here the promise is that the gift of God shall come on all men to justification of life. Just as extensively as judgment has passed upon all, just so extensively shall the free gift come upon all.—If you restrict one, you must restrict the other. If you say that justification of life does not come upon every individual, then you must take the ground that every individual has not come into condemnation. But you cannot restrict this. By the grace of God through Jesus Christ, the whole world shall be brought into justification of life, and shall enjoy all the blessings of salvation. “For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.” Now mark, here, and see how far the argument of our friend fails of removing the argument predicated on this passage. His argument is, that Christ came to restore from the effects of the fall, but not to restore the whole world to a state of righteousness and justification. For some, after all, notwithstanding all God has done, may remain in despair to all eternity. But the argument of the Apostle is, that by the obedience and righteousness of Jesus Christ, those who were made sinners, shall be made righteous.—



The laws of language, and especially the language of the Bible, requires that the same *many* that are condemned, shall be justified. The same *many* that were made sinners, shall be made righteous. But our friend says Christ came to place man in the same condition he was in before the fall, and yet maintains that God suspends his salvation on certain conditions, and that men may live and die sinners and be eternally miserable, and that without remedy, notwithstanding all Jesus Christ has done.

Now Paul's argument is not that all will be placed in a salvable condition, and then many of them be lost; but that the *all*, and the *many*, that were sinners under condemnation, shall be made righteous and be justified. This is his conclusion: "That as sin hath reigned unto death." How far has sin reigned unto death? On all men. "So death passed upon all men for that all have sinned"—"even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." Now, just so far as sin hath reigned unto death, (and it hath reigned in every individual,) just so far will grace reign, through righteousness unto eternal life. All shall be restored to holiness and happiness in a state of immortality. There are no *ifs* and *ands* in the matter. It cannot admit of the least shadow of doubt. It is absolutely certain here, that the Apostle intends to prove, as Dr. Clarke says, "that the salvation from sin here, is as extensive and complete as the guilt and contamination of sin—that death is conquered, hell disappointed, the devil confounded, and sin totally destroyed." And here is ground to shout, Amen! Hallalulah! The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth! Amen! and Amen! And I should think that our friend Power would shout too, in view of such a prospect. But he wont even say Amen with Dr. Clarke.

I will here say a word about those questions, as our friend will not forget them when he gets up, and I want to save him trouble. He will probably say I am bound to answer all questions, yes, or no, on the ground of our agreement. But you will recollect that I made a reserve; because he might ask me questions that I nor no other man could answer, but I would answer all reasonable

questions. But I did not suppose he was going to ask eight or ten in a string. Well, I answered two or three, and he appeared to be no nearer the end, than when he began. I did not know but he might stand all day asking questions. Now I would not make an unqualified agreement to give a yes, or no, to all the questions a man might ask.

In regard to the individuals mentioned. I admitted that they went out of this world unholy. But could not enter heaven unholy, and that they were in a state of conscious existence. Now he wants to know whether I believe they are unhappy or not. If they are unholy, they are unhappy, that is evident. If they are in precisely the same moral condition that they were in when they left this world, they are unhappy. But I believe they are not unholy now. But I do not pretend to know all about the future state—only I believe, and have shown you, that God will wipe tears from off all faces, and hence a change will, and must take place. I do not pretend to know when this will take place. It may take place in death, or after death. I do not know all about this. But it is not my business to show that there is *no* punishment after death, but that there is not an *endless* punishment. It is for my friend to show that there is an endless punishment; and as yet he has brought almost nothing that has any bearing on this subject. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S SIXTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Judges* :—I resume the investigation of this important subject, by making a passing remark or two on the gentleman's last speech. With reference to those questions proposed—I wish to remind you that this engagement was not entered into at my instance, in the first place. My friend, Mr. Doolittle, had proposed questions to me several times, and I answered them; but he declined throughout to answer mine. And when he again proposed an important question, and wanted a direct answer, I then proposed to answer that or any other question he might ask me during the discussion, reserving three min-

utes to explain, if I was misunderstood in my answer, provided he would do the same. This was fair and honorable. And no advantage could be gained by either party. This agreement was entered into on both sides, and we now stand pledged before this community to fulfill our agreement. And when I am unwilling to answer any question that will admit of it, yes, or no, I will then release him; but till then I shall hold him to his engagement. I am ready, in the investigation of any question, to make such an agreement. It is just as binding on me as it is on him.

In reference to the general promises, and especially his remarks on the 5th of Rom. It will be seen, that instead of examining my proof texts, some of which he has never touched, he has spent his speech in falling back on his affirmative, and has given us perhaps the fifteenth edition of his speech made in the first part of the discussion. And, you will mark, he has tried to amend his affirmative proof again and again. He said they trust for final salvation on the suffering, and death, and merits of Jesus Christ. But I have shown you, on his affirmative, that his system excludes Christ, in His life, death, resurrection, and in every characteristic belonging to Him as a Savior, unless he can exert omnipotent power in the resurrection; but this he cannot do; for the system holds that he is a finite being.

We have shown you that his system neither pardons men after death, nor saves them from sin, nor from the punishment of sin, in this world. And if it does not, it is absurd to talk of pardoning sin at all. So we hope to hear no more from the gentleman, of being justified or pardoned through Jesus Christ, unless he changes his whole ground with regard to the character his system gives to the Savior.

The general promises and the discipline. All these things which belong properly to his affirmative, he brings up on my question. But I do not complain of this, and here renew his license to attack my position as he chooses. But to create a difficulty on the 5th of Rom. he had to correct the text, making it read, "the free gift *shall come*," in the future; while the apostle has it in the past tense.—

We showed that this free gift had reference to the vicarious sufferings and atonement of Christ. And this *was* made. Therefore, it is spoken of in the past tense. The apostasy of Adam and his race, is atoned for, so that, by accepting the terms of mercy, men may obtain pardon and the favor of God; and if they die in this state they are saved in heaven. This difficulty—that if Christ made atonement for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and if the debt was paid, how can God require it again?—we will answer. That, by the atonement, satisfaction was made for all of our race. But salvation is by grace. The merits of the Savior's death made satisfaction, so far, that God can be just and the justifier of every one that believeth. And the benefits of the atonement are enjoyed by man, on conditions of repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. And we give the proof. Mark, the point is that through the atonement of Jesus Christ, the benefit of it is applied to every individual, so that if he dies in infancy he is saved in heaven, but if he commits actual sin, he is pardoned and saved only on condition of repentance and faith. This proof has been given before: Rom iii. 24, 26. "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God, to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness, that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

Now we return to the point on my first proposition, that God threatens sinners with misery which they cannot fully experience in this world, and of absolute necessity it extends into the future world.

We have adduced a number of Scriptures on this subject, and now proceed to make a few passing remarks on the gentleman's comments on the case of the rich man and Lazarus.

He asked if we understood this to be a literal matter of fact, and was answered in the affirmative; and subsequently we stated that such was the nature of some of the

facts, that it required figurative language to convey the idea to the human mind. He tried to find something ludicrous in this case. But what are the literal facts when viewed candidly? Why, there was a rich man who lived in guilt and sin, died and was hurried. There is no absurdity in this. The gentleman has admitted that men die and go into the future world unholy. Again, there was a poor man who begged at the rich man's door, and the dogs licked his sores. There is no absurdity in all this. We have witnessed it all. But he died and was carried by angels to Abraham's bosom. The gentleman tried to make this ludicrous, by maintaining that the poor man's literal body was carried by angels to Abraham's bosom. But this is a bare assumption. The Bible does not say this. And it is fairly to be inferred that his body was buried, and that it was his spirit that was conveyed to Abraham's bosom. And is there any thing ludicrous in the idea that a spirit, redeemed by the blood of Christ, and prepared by faith and holy living, should be accompanied by these invisible angelic spirits up to the throne of God? Again, he tried to start a difficulty about Abraham's bosom, literally. The nature of the case required figurative language. The paradise of God is figuratively represented by Abraham's bosom. The rich man in hell lifted up his eyes being in torment. Is there any thing absurd in this, that a man who had resisted the Spirit of God, who had withheld the service of his life from his Maker, had lived in rebellion against God, and died unholy—that he should be excluded from the society of the holy? Nothing absurd here. Mr. D. has admitted that men go into the eternal world unholy, and that they cannot enter heaven without a moral change. And is it ludicrous that he should lift up his eyes in this state? This is the language of the Bible, and every man's conscience, whatever may be his creed, tells him that this is what might be.

He attempts to make it appear that the call for water was absurd. What does this amount to, keeping in mind that language must be used that we could understand?—Water asked for was an indication of pain. This was denied. But he stated that there was a prayer meeting in

hell. But this was not prayer to God; and it was a selfish request. He knew if his five brethren came there, it would increase his misery. It was sheer selfishness that led him to make this request. But is it at all absurd that he should have five brethren whom he did not want to come where he was? No. The gentleman said that the inhabitants of heaven and hell wished to change places. But this is not the fact. The rich man did not ask to exchange—he did not dare to do it—for he knew it would not be granted. And no wish is expressed by the inhabitants of heaven to go to hell. And the language used shows the absolute impossibility of going from one place to the other.

In Rev. ii. 20—23, facts are described, as is admitted by all competent critics, and yet such is the nature of those facts, it requires highly figurative language to express them. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S SIXTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen.*—From the fact, that in looking over my minutes of my friend's argument, I find it so difficult to discover any thing that has any bearing on the question, I am at a loss to decide whether he has adduced any proof on his affirmative. I would ask what proof he brought while last speaking?

The first thing I noticed is, he says I am not satisfied with my argument, previously made, but am trying to mend it, by bringing proof against his position. It is sufficient for this, to say, it is his statement, not mine.

I intend to notice all the proof that he will bring forward. I pledge myself that no proof, that can be called proof, which he will bring, shall pass unnoticed: But, as yet, he has brought no evidence on the point, which is the endless misery of a portion of the human race in a state of immortality. Now if he will bring forward, and I challenge him to do it, a single text that teaches this, I will abandon the field. I want him to bring a thus saith the Lord, that says a sinner shall suffer endless misery for his sins. I deny that I have brought forward any proof to strengthen my affirmative on the former

question. I bring it forward as additional proof of my position on this question, and I have an abundance to bring forward yet. There is line upon line, and precept upon precept, teaching the glorious doctrine of the salvation of all men, and I do not bring it forward because I think my previous argument lacked for Scripture proof, but to show you the abundance of evidence there is on this subject.—Our friend says he understands the Bible to teach salvation by grace, and not by personal sufferings. Well, so do I. We agree in this; I am glad we do.

But my friend's is not a scheme of universal salvation and redemption, predicated on the grace of God, bestowed on all through Jesus Christ—through the power of the resurrection—a salvation by grace? I know not the gentleman's object; but I suppose he wanted to convey the idea that we hold that the sinner is saved in some other way than by the grace of God. I have always discarded the idea that we expect to be saved as the reward of faith or obedience, and, therefore, he would make you think that we believe that man is to make his way to heaven, through fire and torment, and after he has suffered a certain amount, demand heaven on the score of justice.—The gentleman tells us that his main position is, that under God's moral government, mankind are threatened with privation and misery, which they cannot fully experience in this world, therefore it must be endured in the future world. But where is this threatening. You remember, I have challenged him to fix his finger, on a single passage of scripture, that teaches endless suffering in an immortal state of existence. This he has not done, and will not during this discussion.

Again, the case of the rich man and Lazarus. Now I want to show again the ridiculousness of understanding this as a literal matter of fact. Our friend, has tried to manifest a little ingenuity, to redeem this passage from the attitude of absurdity and nonsense, in which it was placed by his construction. But he has not been able to do it. Now I ask him on what ground he settles it, that the rich man shall be damned forever? Is it because he was a sinner here? What evidence have we that he

was not as good a man, as my friend Power? There is nothing here expressed nor implied to lead us to suppose, that he had not the patience of Job, the meekness of Moses, the piety of the Psalmist, and in a good degree the wisdom of Solomon. It is all mere assumption, to suppose he was not a good man. And what evidence have we that Lazarus *was* a good man? We are not told, that he was not as corrupt in heart, as he was in body—that morally as well as physically, he was not full of wounds, and bruises and putrifying sores. And of the rich man, how do we know but that he visited the fatherless and the widow in their afflictions, and administered to the wants of the poor and needy? Should he be condemned because he was rich? We have no evidence that he did not make a good use of his riches. Was he unkind to the poor? Of this we have evidence to the contrary. If he had been unfeeling, his door would have been the last place where Lazarus would have been laid to be sustained. This was evidence that he was kind to the poor, that he made a liberal use of his riches. All that is here mentioned of the rich man in this world, is in favor of his being a good man, and there is nothing in favor of Lazarus, but rather against him.—And that he was taken to heaven on the ground, that he was a good man is all assumption.

Again, the gentleman assumes that the *hell* here spoken of, is a place in the future world. Now I want to ask him if this place has some locality in the universe, why we have not, some account of it in the creation of the world. We have an account of the creation of the Sun, and Moon and Stars, and all things upon the Earth, and that all went on in beauty and harmony. "And God saw that every thing that he had made and behold it was very good." But nothing is said about this hell, and it is strange if this hell is so large and is to contain so many people, that we have no account of it at all. We should like to have our friend if he can, give us some account of it, and let us know its whereabouts. But we are sure he can give us no light concerning it. The divines who have held that there was such a place, have never been able to agree where it was. Whiston held that it was lo-



cated in Saturn. And some have held that it was located in some of the comets, and when the comet approaches the Sun, they are scorched and burnt with its intense heat, and when it recedes back into the cold regions of space, they are frozen with the intense cold; so they will be eternally scorching and freezing. Another divine, who was engaged in getting up a reform in N. Y., gave it as his opinion that it was located in the bowels of the earth, about thirty miles below its surface, and that volcanoes were mere safety valves. Well by and by at the end of time, there will be an explosion, and this vast globe was to become a liquid lake of fire and brimstone, and all the righteous will be taken up to heaven, and all the wicked, will remain here forever.—Now our friend seems to hold that there is some such place—a hell of endless misery,—a lake, or place of fire and brimstone.—But I deny that the term translated *hell* in this parable, is even used in the Bible, to signify a place of punishment in the future world. The original signification of the term *Gehenna*, we have told you meant the valley of the son of Hinnom, and the word *Hades*, in the new Testament and *Sheol* in the old Testament, both literally signify, as all able commentators tell us the *grave* or the *place of the dead* generally, without any reference to their moral character, happiness or misery. The term is sometimes used in a figurative sense, to denote mental suffering, but never in the future world. Says David “the sorrows of death compassed me, and the pains of hell got hold on me Psal. cxvi, 3.” Here the term is used to denote mental suffering. Again, David found himself in the lowest hell. Now can there be a hell—lower than the lowest? David was in the lowest hell, and surely he did not go into the future world to find it, David was a great sinner, and was as he terms it, cast into the lowest hell. But he was delivered. He says, “Thou (God) hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell,” Psal., lxxxvi. 13.

Again, “the wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God” Psal. ix. 19, *i. e.* into *Sheol* or the grave, wicked nations bring on themselves, swift destruction and are turned into their graves.—But this

has no reference to a future world; and I challenge the gentleman to produce from the Bible, a single passage that proves a state of punishment in the immortal world.

The gentleman's position, is that Gods moral government threatens men with suffering, which they cannot fully experience in this world, consequently they must suffer in the future world. Now we deny that the Bible teaches any such doctrine from Gen. to Rev., and we challenge him to show it. But my friends to negative this doctrine of endless misery, I take the ground that sin is a finite principle, therefore, endless punishment is unjust. It is a principle in natural philosophy that an *effect* cannot exceed the *cause* that produces it. Now punishment is an effect of sin, and sin the cause. Now as sin is a finite cause, it cannot be deserving of infinite punishment. What is sin? Sin is a transgression of the law. Who commits sin? Man. Is man infinite? No, his capacities are all finite, and consequently all his acts are finite. None but God can perform an infinite act. Now as sin is finite, a God of infinite justice, whose Throne is based on principles of eternal justice and equity, never will inflict endless punishment, for a transient finite crime. For this would be at war with his justice. Endless punishment for finite crimes, is a punishment infinitely disproportionate to the desert of the crime. I hope the gentleman will attend to this argument. [*Time Expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S SEVENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators*:—A few remarks first in relation to the gentleman's last argument, formed on the philosophical principle that a finite cause cannot produce an infinite effect. Punishment, he says, is the effect of sin, and as sin is finite, therefore the punishment must be finite.

But his logic is as false as his theology. The fallacy lies in using the terms *endless* and *infinite* as perfectly synonymous, while they are infinitely different. *Infinite* has neither beginning nor end, nor any limit whatever.—But there is a beginning to all punishment, and though it

may extend on endlessly, it will eternally be less than *infinite*. Are the pious, subjects of *infinite* happiness? No; only *endless* happiness. So with the sinner. He is a finite being, and cannot be subject to infinite punishment; and this we never contended—but he may be subject to *endless* punishment. So Mr. D.'s logic and philosophy both fail him.

With reference to the locality of hell, or of heaven, we barely observe, that the Bible fully warrants the belief that heaven and hell imply both a state and a place; but in regard to the locality of either; it makes no revelation. But this has nothing to do with the question. God has said there is a heaven, or place of happiness, for the righteous, and a hell, or place of punishment, for the finally impenitent, and this is enough.

He says that David was not only in hell, but in the lowest hell on earth. This we deny; and if it is shown that we are right, all his argument on this falls to the ground.

It is common, when men have been rescued from imminent danger, to say they have been saved from it. For example, a person falls from his horse, his foot is caught in the stirrup, his horse runs—he is now in imminent danger of death. But a person seizes his horse and saves him immediately, he says, "I was delivered from a most horrid death." So it was with David. He was in imminent danger of the lowest hell, of punishment in the future world, on account of his sins, but he was saved from it *literally*. And he exclaims that God had delivered him from the lowest hell.

But he says, "the pains of hell got hold on me." What does this mean? A conviction of sin and guilt, and the disapprobation of God, which is called by the Redeemer the worm that dieth not. And every one who is guilty, feels more or less of the pains and anguish he will eternally experience, if he is shut out from the presence of God, after death.

Salvation by grace. We again say, the gentleman's assertions to the contrary notwithstanding, that his *system* does hold that men are not saved from sin by grace at all; for it holds that no man is saved from sin or from the pen-

alty of sin, by any body or any thing. It holds that every person fully meets the demands of the law in his own person. The gentleman may deny this. But if he alludes to it much more, we may have occasion to test the truth of the charge, by direct questions. We will see if he denies.

Now we proceed to the argument. Mr. D. says we bring nothing to prove *endless* punishment. But he has been informed that this is not the point now under consideration. The point now is, that God's moral government, as revealed in the Bible, promises men life and happiness which they cannot fully enjoy in this world, and threatens the finally impenitent with privation and misery which they cannot fully experience in this world, and hence by an absolute necessity it must extend into the future world. In proof of this, we have quoted the language of Christ to his disciples, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell," or in a future state of misery. And that the blasphemer is in danger of eternal damnation. And we have cited the case of the rich man, who was in a state of suffering after death and in the future world. And Dr. Clarke is with us in all these points. And to come still closer, we adduced the case of a great number of persons from different nations, who were the subjects of the *general promises*, but who left this world in crime; and we asked the gentleman directly, 1st, whether they left this world *unholy*, and he answered in the affirmative—and 2d, whether they could enter heaven *unholy*, and he answered in the negative—and 3d, whether they are in a state of conscious existence from death till the resurrection, and he gave an affirmative answer—and 4th, whether in that state they are happy or miserable; but this question you recollect he refused to answer. And yet his whole character stands pledged to give answers, and we shall hold him responsible to do it: but wave it now.

But unholiness and misery are inseparably connected; and as they went into the eternal world unholy, and are in a state of conscious existence, according to his own admission, it follows absolutely that they do suffer in the future world.

Now you see the gentleman is in a great difficulty here. And the best thing he could do, was to make a *conjecture*, that all those who went into the future world unholy, had in some way or other met with a change.

This audience will recollect that, a few days since, Mr. D. took the ground that all persons, including your humble speaker in particular, have to undergo a moral change before they can enter heaven, and staked the whole result on the change being made in the resurrection. This was his strong ground—that the resurrection alone is to effect this change. But Mr. Doolittle to-day, entirely refutes Mr. Doolittle a few days since, and contradicts him. He admits that these persons went into the future world unholy, but says they are changed *before* the resurrection. Now if he was right a few days since, he is, beyond all doubt, in an error now. The truth is, you all see, that he is swamped.

Perhaps he may turn another corner. He may say that the resurrection has already taken place; for it is not sure but that he will be crowded into that corner yet. Or he may say that the resurrection takes place immediately after death. But all his former argument will meet him in the face, if he undertakes to turn this way.

Now we have proved from the Bible, and have the authority of his friend, Dr. Clarke, and the gentleman's own admission, that men go into the future world unholy. And he says that men cannot be happy if they are unholy.—And he has previously taken the ground, most strongly, that no change is effected till the resurrection, which is yet future, at the final consummation of all things, as he has so often told us. Then it follows, with all the force of demonstration, and that too from his own arguments and admissions, that some men are now in misery in the eternal world. There is no salvation for the gentleman but to retract his position.

But we proceed with our subject. And as my second step in the argument, I lay down this proposition: *The only principle by which man can secure his happiness in heaven, and avoid the misery of the future world, is, that he possess faith and holiness in this life.*

We cite a text already used, but having a direct bearing on this point. As we design only to give a specimen of the testimony which the sacred record affords, we shall not multiply quotations. John iii. 36, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." This text shows that the only principle fixed by the Almighty, on which man can secure heaven and avoid hell, is faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Again, Mark xvi. 15, 16, "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."

On this testimony, which is but a mere specimen on this point, we remark on the first text, that it teaches that these two moral acts, of belief and unbelief, which fix the two moral states that are represented in this text, are direct counter parts in their effect and in their duration. First, faith—by which we mean the faith that works by love and purifies the heart, and leads to acts of self-denial and continual obedience to God—is inseparably connected, by the unerring wisdom of God, with eternal life, the highest blessing which the atonement of Jesus Christ provides for man, and presents to him in this or the future world. But Mr. D. may attempt to start a difficulty, that this life is promised in the present tense. But there is no difficulty here. This life, means the life of love, joy and peace, that is consequent on believing in Jesus Christ. This commences in the believer's heart as soon as he exercises faith, and if he is faithful till death, continues forever. It is perfectly appropriate then to say, he that believeth *hath* eternal life.

Unbelief and condemnation, or damnation, are the counter part, just the opposite of belief and eternal life. We have remarked, and the gentleman has not controverted the position, that having gospel faith beyond this world is impossible. For after this life all is knowledge, every thing is visible, and there is no room for this gospel faith. Christ, as revealed in the Bible, is the only object of faith, and we can have faith in him now from the fact that he is

not visible; but just the moment the curtain of mortality is dropped, he becomes visible, and is no longer an object of faith, but of sight and knowledge; and faith in him then, as a pardoning Savior, is absolutely impossible. But he that believeth not shall be damned. And my friend has admitted that men have left this world in unbelief, and have gone into the future world unholy, where this faith cannot be exercised, and as faith is the only condition of salvation—eternal life—they must eternally, by an absolute necessity, be deprived of eternal life—a state of happiness and peace in God. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S SEVENTH REPLY.]

*My Friends.*—I have not been particular to mark all the meanderings of the course taken by my friend Power, because I was aware that he was getting off from the question. I could not see that he was adducing any proof on the main question. But he says he will get to it by and by, and I hope he will. But, as yet, we say, he has not brought a particle of proof that has a bearing on the endless misery of a portion of the human race, in a state of immortality.

I will now notice a statement which he made, concerning my argument to prove that the sinner could not merit an infinite or endless punishment. Why does our friend take the ground that we cannot, by our good works, merit endless happiness? Why, simply because we are finite. The grace of God has to come in unmerited too, to give us eternal life and happiness. But he states that the sinner is deserving endless punishment. Now, how is this? It is a poor rule that will not work both ways. If we cannot deserve endless happiness because we are finite, how can we on the same rule, deserve endless misery? And there certainly is no principle of God's nature to come in and freely bestow upon us misery which we do not deserve.

Now when he will show that we can merit endless happiness for our good works, I will then acknowledge that we can deserve endless misery for our bad works. We

have just as much ability to do good as we have to do evil, hence, if we cannot merit endless happiness for our good works, we cannot deserve endless punishment for our bad works. This doctrine of endless punishment is one of the most monstrous doctrines that ever had a being. To which, the desert of sin can have no comparison. But still our friend would have you believe that sin requires endless punishment on the score of justice. But this idea is at eternal war with justice.

But the gentleman thinks he has brought proof after proof. But we have examined all that he can claim as proof. We have showed that the term, rendered soul, in Matth. x. 27, 28, did not mean the immortal spirit, but the animal life. And as to the sin against the Holy Ghost, we have proved that this blasphemy had reference to the Jewish dispensation. We quoted, too, in accordance with our views, Dr. Clarke's opinion on this subject. But he says he has brought forward other proof. He has proved that everlasting life is promised, on condition of faith — Well, this we believe. But this, you see, is enjoyed in the present tense. "He that believeth on me *hath* eternal life." But he that believeth not, the wrath of God abideth on him." How long does it abide on him? As long as he abideth in unbelief. But has he proved that men will remain in unbelief to all eternity? If he will bring forward one, thus saith the Lord, to show that any will remain in unbelief eternally, I will give up the point. The wrath of God may rest on the unbeliever to-day, and to-morrow he may become a believer, and enjoy the favor of God.

In confirmation of his point, he quotes Mark xvi. 15, 16. "And he said unto them, go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Now, my friends, I want you to notice this passage, and you will see that it is all confined to this world. Christ told his disciples to go forth into all the world. "And these signs," he says, "shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues. They shall take up



serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them—they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover.” Now, suppose I am an Infidel, and I come to my friend Power, who professes to be a believer, and I ask him as an unbeliever, for evidence of this fact. I ask him if he can cast out devils, or speak with tongues, or drink deadly poison, and not be injured by it, or lay hands on the sick and they shall recover? Well, can he give me any one of these evidences that he is a believer? No! Hence, I come to the conclusion that his profession is like a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. So would the result have been with the disciples, had they not been able to give these signs. We find on the day of pentecost, when so many were converted by the outpouring of the spirit, that they did speak with new tongues, that these signs and wonders followed them, and those declarations of our Savior had particular reference to that occasion, the Apostolic age. Now, one who did not believe when he saw these signs, those miraculous gifts, attending the believer, but continued to disbelieve the Gospel, should be condemned, he sinned against great light. But how long is he condemned?—Just as long as he continues a disbeliever, and no longer. And, now, as we have said, if our friend will prove that any one will disbelieve to all eternity, then he sustains his position, but not otherwise.

Now it is evident, that when all men shall be raised up, as we have proved, into the glorious light and liberty of the children of God, and shall become equal unto the angels, and become the children of God, because children of the resurrection, there will be no more unbelief abiding in any heart. And how can any sinner, or moral delinquent remain after this glorious change? How defenceless must our friend's cause be, to lead him to bring forward passages that have no reference at all to his position. Why, I tell you, his cause is a fruitless one, and all his efforts will prove a perfect failure. It is a failure thus far, and I predict it will continue to be so. Not because he has failed to do well, or that a more able man could be brought forward on his side, but because his cause is at war with the truth. The Bible does not teach his doc-

trine. It is at war with the glorious doctrine of salvation taught by Jesus Christ.

The gentleman would make us believe that he is only settling some points, but why does he not come right to the main point at issue? If we are in such imminent danger, right on the brink of destruction, exposed to an endless hell; and if he believes this, why does he not come right to the point and show that this is the fact? Why, if I believed his doctrine, I would not give sleep to my eyes, or slumber to my eyelids, nor take any rest till I had settled this question in all minds, if I could. But such a doctrine I cannot believe. It is a most monstrous doctrine, and it is a source of grief and regret to think that in this enlightened age of the world, and in this highly intelligent community, that I have found it necessary to come forty miles to combat such a doctrine, and to prove that it is absurd and false. Alas! for the genius of endless misery, "she has no head, and cannot think; no heart, and cannot feel; her prayers are curses; her God is a demon; her vengeance is eternity; her communion is death; and if she stops for a moment in her infernal flight, it is on some kindred rock to whet her vulture-fangs for keener rapine, and replume her wings for more sanguinary desolation." And yet the gentleman comes up here and claims credit for this doctrine—that it is the peaceable Gospel of Christ. When it is a libel on all that bears the name of Gospel. A *doctrine* that maintains that the groans, and tears, and anguish of a great portion of our race, will be witnessed forever and ever, in the immortal world, the Gospel! Monstrous! I tell you, my friends, this doctrine originated in the dark ages. It is of heathenish origin. It has already been exposed and utterly exploded in many parts of christendom, and the work is still going on, and I venture to predict that within fifty years, this doleful doctrine of endless woe, will not be heard of in the length and breadth of our land.

Our friend says I have admitted, on this floor, that some go out of this world unreconciled to God. I have admitted this, and I believe that hundreds and thousands, and millions of heathen have died without any faith in Christ,

of whom even they have never heard, and without any hope of eternal life. This we admit, and I have also contended that even our friend Power will leave this world not wholly reconciled, and that the best christians that ever lived, were not entirely sinless when they left the world.

But I have contended that God, by his mighty power, will perfect a change in every heart, and that in the resurrection, all shall be raised incorrupt and pure, and glorious, and possess God's own moral image of purity.—Then our friend here will have no moral defilement attached to him, but he, and all redeemed mankind, will be like the angels in heaven, pure and holy, and happy, and not subject to death, or any evil more. And I referred to Rev. to show that all the intelligent universe shall then shout blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever.

Now, as to any concessions that I have made, if he can make any capital out of them he is entirely welcome to it.

My friends, I have much testimony, on my side, bearing directly on this question, but I forbear to bring it forward now. I will bring it up occasionally. But I want the gentleman to bring forward his proof. And, now, if he has strong proof, I hope he will produce it immediately.

[*Time expired.*]

---

MONDAY, AUG, 4—9 O'CLOCK, A. M.

---

[MR. POWER'S EIGHTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Judges.*—Before addressing myself immediately to the question under consideration. I beg leave to make a few remarks on some incidental matters that it may be well to understand to save time and avoid confusion. And first with reference to the duty of the honorable judges. The question was suggested by one of them on

Saturday afternoon, whether their office imposed on them the duty of deciding whether the disputants were investigating the points at issue or not. This is a point that is of importance clearly to understand. And as far as my knowledge extends with reference to discussions of this kind, it is not a duty devolving on the judges to decide whether the premises taken by either speaker are in point or not. This is not a duty that ought to be imposed on the judges. It often happens that judges are chosen who have very little acquaintance with the study of theology, and it would be unreasonable to make it their duty to decide whether the speaker was pursuing the proper train of argument or not to prove his point. They often could not do it. The true position then is if one of the speakers raise the question whether his opponent is speaking to the question or not, according to the rules they have adopted, if they cannot settle it they appeal to the judges, and give their reasons, and the judges decide the matter. But the judges have nothing to do with any such points, till the question is raised by the speakers, and their decision is appealed to.

I have a right to call my respondent to order at any time when I think he is departing from the question. And he has the same right towards me. And when it is appealed to the judges, and they hear the reasons on both sides, it is then their duty to decide. We make these remarks to save your honors from any undue solicitude in this matter, and that the audience may not think that you are neglecting your duty if they think we are wandering from the question.

This same question arose in a discussion we had some time since, the presiding judge was an aged and talented gentleman of the bar, long accustomed to hear pleadings, and arguments in debate. He decided the points as named above.

When these principles are observed there is little danger of difficulty occurring between the speakers and the audience.

A few words on another point. Mr. D. has charged me a number of times since I have been on my affirmative,

with not coming to the main point. You will recollect that my friend spoke three days and one hour on his affirmative, and that I did not charge him once with being out of order, or of not discussing the main point. And I have now spent but one day and half an hour on my affirmative, and the note has been sounded by him in almost every speech. "Why does he not come to the point in the question?" Well this is not a strange note. It is a stereotyped matter on the point of the advocates of Universalism, and such little points so often alluded to have their effect on a congregation not acquainted with Universalist tactics of theological warfare.

I might have forestalled the gentleman if I had wished to hinder free discussion. You recollect that the main point in his affirmative had reference to the condition of man in a state of immortality, as much as in my affirmative. But you will recollect also, that he gave us many learned lectures on the creation of man,—the constitutional Adam,—the life and death of Jesus Christ,—the will of God,—the purpose of God,—the sovereignty of God. *i. e.* And I have down on my notes probably not less than a dozen chapters of this kind, on all of which I might have raised the question, why take up these things that have nothing to do with man in a state of immortality? Why not come to the question? But for him to investigate the matter thoroughly, I knew he could not bring all into one point.

The argument did not all consist of one point, and he told us that it formed a chain. And I was willing he should work on which link he chose.

I have made but two propositions, as premises in my argument. And have but one more to make, and then all my premises will be laid down.

So in point of number of propositions, we are far behind our honorable opponent. And unless he abjures all consistency, we hope the enquiry "why dont he come to the point?" will not be heard again.

We do not make these observation in the character of complaint, but to save him the necessity of starting again his enquiry so often repeated.

We now call attention to our true position on the question before us.

We stated in the opening of this question, that man is an intelligent subject of God's moral government, and that this government recognizes man's moral accountability in this world with reference to his destiny in the future world. We then showed that God's revealed word to man promised rewards which could not be fully enjoyed in this world, and threatened the finally impenitent with privation and misery, which could not be fully experienced in this life, and of absolute necessity must extend into the future world.

I adduce proof on the second proposition showing distinctly the only condition on which man can escape perdition and misery in the future world, and receive life and happiness in heaven: viz. faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, that faith which works by love, and purifies the heart.

We now proceed to show in the third place that as God has revealed his will to man, both with reference to time and eternity, apprising him of the consequences of sin in both worlds, and has revealed the plan by which he can avoid sin here, and its consequences hereafter, viz. by faith and holiness, so God intends to bring man individually before His bar in judgment, there to decide his case according to the use or abuse he has made of his faculties for eternity.

We waive remark on Mr. D's. reply on Saturday evening till we have a larger congregation, as Monday morning is unfavorable for the people to come out. As considerable effort was made in that speech, we wish as many to be present when its true character is presented, as were when it was delivered. It will then be shown that it has no force whatever against our position.

We now take up the third proposition, that God will bring every man before his bar in final judgment, and that His decision at that time will fix the destiny of each one for eternity according to his moral character here on earth.

My first position under this head is, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments teach the doctrine of a uni-

versal or general judgment, including the case of every individual of the human family. As it may save time if the gentleman chooses to answer, I will ask him if he agrees with me in this position, that there will be a general judgment, saying nothing about the time? [Mr. Doolittle answered in the affirmative.]

I ask him one more question equally fair and as easily answered—if he believes that Jesus Christ will be the judge in this universal judgment? [Mr. Doolittle replied that he was not prepared to answer this question.] I will not press the question as he declines answering, but will adduce the proof to show that Jesus Christ will be the judge in the universal judgment. 2 Cor. v. 10. "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things *done* in *his* body, according to that he hath done, whether *it be* good or bad," Here the term *all* is used with reference to mankind, our race, without any restriction whatever, and we maintain that the Apostle includes the whole human race. Again: Acts, xvii. 30, 31. "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent. Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained: whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." That the whole world is included here the gentleman will not controvert. Neither will he contend that the whole world is not included in the passage quoted from Cor. And that the Lord Jesus Christ is to be the judge in this case no one can doubt. These two points then are settled. First that the Scriptures teach that there will be a universal judgment of mankind. This the gentleman acceded to. And secondly we have proved that Jesus Christ will be the judge at this universal judgment, that includes every member of the human race.

Under this head we are to show that this judgment is yet future, and that its final decision will fix man's destiny for eternity according to his moral character in this life. This judgment will take place at the close of the constitution of this world, in the final winding up of all its affairs.

[Mr. Doolittle here asked Mr. Power, if he believed that the present world was a state of retribution of rewards and punishment. To which Mr. Power replied that he did not.] [*Time expired*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S EIGHTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators.*—I am at a great loss this morning, to know how to occupy my thirty minutes, as our friend has declined replying to my last speech, on Saturday morning, and has not brought forward any particular proof on his final argument this morning. However, I would not wish to spend time uselessly, and think it would be well to take a glance at the progress we have made thus far on this question. Our friend, in the outset on his affirmative, took the position, that under the moral government of God, in this world, man is threatened with punishment for sin, which cannot be fully endured in this world; and, therefore, must be endured in a future world. This position I deny. But I want you to bear in mind wherein we are at issue. I admit, with him, that all men as rational and moral beings, are subjects of the moral government of God in this world, and are responsible to that government for their actions. I admit that God, under his moral government over moral beings in this world, threatens them with punishment for sin. But I contend that such threatening extends only to this, and not to a future world. Our friend quoted several passages, which he thinks, prove his position—he quoted concerning being destroyed, both soul and body, in hell, and the sin against the Holy Ghost, and the rich man and Lazarus—and we have weighed them all in the balance, and found them wanting.

Again: our friend takes a position which he thinks has bearing on the final issue, viz: That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments teach a universal judgment. Well, I admitted this. But notwithstanding my admission, he brings forward the proof. He goes further; he proves that Jesus Christ is to be judge of all men at this judgment. Well, I fully admit the fact, and do not wish to controvert



the point with him. But here is the issue. My friend says that this universal judgment is future, and is to take place in a state of immortality. This we deny. Remember, I admit the universality of the judgment, and though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not go unpunished.—But this punishment I contend is in this world—here we are at issue. And, in order to show that he is wrong, and I am right, I shall prove that it is *in this world* that sinners are punished. The gentleman, in answer to my question, says that he does not believe that this world is a state of rewards and punishment. Here the gentleman is in the wrong, and I am going to prove it; and you, my friends, are to be the judges, and I want you to lay aside prepossessed prejudices, and render a righteous verdict.—We have not come here to decide this matter according to our creeds, but according to arguments, drawn from the Scriptures, and we should decide as in the presence of God, and according to the light of Divine truth.

I will now endeavor to show that the universal judgment is not in the future world.

And, first, I will examine some texts our friend has quoted. 2d Cor. v. 10. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things *done* in *his* body according to that he hath done, whether *it* be good or bad." Now mark this language. Does it say any thing about a judgment in a future world? Not a word! But where are the rewards and punishments to be received? And where is this judgment to take place? In the body or out of the body? In this or a future world? Why it is in the body where men perform the acts for which they are rewarded or punished. To understand this passage better, we will leave out the italics which are not in the original. The translators put them in, no doubt, according to the influence on their minds, as in many other cases, they have done. In many places they have obscured the sense by their additions, instead of making it any plainer; and, at other times, have not expressed the sense of the original, in the best manner. This is admitted by many able commentators, and hence, the necessity of a new translation. Our Baptist

friends have given a new translation, making many alterations and improvements—for example: the word baptise, they have translated *immerse*, according to its true meaning. Hence, I say, the language here, leaving out the words which the translators have added, which have no place in the original, is clear and definite that the rewards are to be received in the body in the present world, and not in the spirit world. I will read it, leaving out the supplied words. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things in body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad." There is no reference here to the future world.—Each one is to receive the things *in body*. Where a man sows there he shall reap. "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption, but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting." The retribution is meted out *in the body*, not out of it. And this harmonizes with other passages of Scripture relative to the judgment. Now, I am going to show that the judgment is in this world, if there is any truth in the Bible. Elder Power says he lays no claim to infallibility—neither do I. But you are to remember, it is not his opinion, nor mine, that is to decide this matter, but the Bible.

Now my proof shall be plain, and to the point, and no conditions in the case. The first testimony I quote, is Eccle. iii. 16, 17. "And moreover, I saw under the sun the place of judgment, that wickedness was there; and the place of righteousness, that iniquity was there. I said in my heart, God shall judge the righteous and the wicked: for there is a time there for every purpose, and for every work."

This text declares, unequivocally, that the place of judgment is *under the sun*. Why under the sun? Because *wickedness was there, and the place of righteousness*.—This, I have said, is to the point, but I will not rest all my proof here, I have more of it. Said the Savior, "Now is the judgment of this world." And do you not see that our friend Power and the Savior are at direct issue here? Our friend says the judgment is yet future, but the Savior says "Now is the judgment of this world, and now shall

the prince of this world be cast out,"—John xii. 31. Now we are to look on this, not to the future world, for the judgment.

Again: it is evident, from the declaration of Christ, that the judgment of his administration commenced with the opening of his mission, the commencement of the Gospel day, and will continue during his whole reign. God has appointed a day, we are told in Acts, in which he will judge the world in righteousness. This day is evidently the Gospel day. The reign of Christ, and this accords with what is said in Isa. xlii. 4. "He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law."

The judgment, in its proper sense, is to pass upon all men. But this judgment has been going forward from the commencement of the Gospel dispensation until now, and it will continue to go on till the end of time; for there is a God that judgeth in the earth. Though our friend says it is in a future world. This is his opinion, but his opinion is not what we want. What do the Scriptures teach? is the inquiry. And we find that they teach the opposite of what our friend teaches, on this subject.

We now proceed to produce other proof, by way of answering his affirmative, in favor of the ultimate holiness of all men in a state of immortality. And the argument is one I hope he will attend to. I quote 1st John iii. 8. "He that committeth sin is of the devil, for the devil sinneth from the beginning; for this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil."

Again: Heb. ii. 14, 15. "For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil. And deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." Now it is clear, from these passages, that the works of the devil and the devil himself shall be destroyed. How, then, can our friend make out that the wicked shall be punished after the devil and his works are destroyed? But he contends that the devil will not be destroyed, but will exist as long as

God exists. But the Scripture clearly proves, as we have seen, that the devil and his works shall both be destroyed. I will now adduce some Scripture that goes directly against endless punishment. Psalm ciii. 8, 9. "The Lord is merciful and gracious; slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide; neither will he keep his anger for ever." Lam. iii. 31, 32. "For the Lord will not cast off forever; but though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies." Isa. lvii. 16. "For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth: for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." The argument here, is, that God will not contend for ever, by way of punishment, neither be always wroth: and the reason assigned, is, the spirit would fail before Him, and the souls which He has made. Now, two positions, diametrically opposed, cannot both be true; one of them must be false. If it be true that God will not contend for ever, nor cast off for ever, it cannot be true that he will contend for ever, and always be wroth, the punishment never cease. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S NINTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen. Judges.*—With reference to the gentleman's last quotations from Ps., Lam. and Isa., we place them in a class by themselves, as he has brought them up in proof of his question, which he declined doing when on his affirmative, and will take them up at the proper time, and dispose of them if not to his satisfaction, yet we hope, to the satisfaction of this community.

The gentleman has quoted from 1 John and Hebrews to show that the Savior will destroy the devil and his works. He said I did not believe these texts. I believe every text in the Bible. But do not believe that destruction here means absolute annihilation. In regard to this, however, when he will define what he means by the devil, and by his works, I will show that his interpretation is false, and that these texts afford no support to his system. Till then I shall pass it without any further remarks.

On his counter proof from John xii. 31, "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out." And of Isa. xlii. 4. "He shall not fail, nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law."—I have only to make a few explanatory remarks. The term *judgment* in the Holy Scriptures is used with some variety of signification. In some places it means simply—the law of God, or God's will to man as published in His revealed word, and it is in this sense the prophet uses the term here. He shall not fail or be discouraged, till he hath set up his divine will, rule or law in the world among men.

Again—the infinite wisdom of God uses the same term, judgment; in reference to His administration amongst kingdoms and nations in this world. He visits them with his *judgments*. Nations have to be punished in their national character, because their offence is national. But this has nothing to do with individuals in the final judgment.

There are other uses of this term, but I only notice a third application. It is used to denote the time of God's decision of each man's case, fixing his final destiny for eternity, according to his moral character in this life.—This is God's final judgment and retribution. The declaration of Christ, "Now shall the prince of this world be judged," derives its plausibility, in favor of the gentleman's position, if it has any, by assuming that the Lord uses the term judgment in this latter sense. This we deny. And it devolves on him to prove this before the text avails him any thing. But some understand him to mean that this world is now sitting in judgment on its prince, and that it was deciding to crucify him. But he says, "Notwithstanding I am crucified, though now the world judges me, and though I be *lifted up*, yet I will finally draw all men unto me. The scene shall be reversed, and I will bring all men before me in the final judgment, and decide the case, and fix the destiny of each for eternity, according to his doings in this world."

A word now on his quotations from Eccl. iii. 16, 17.—

The gentleman wished to have special attention paid to this passage. "Moreover I saw under the sun the place of judgment, that wickedness was there." What does he say about judgment for this wickedness? I said in mine heart, *God is now judging* the righteous and the wicked? He should say so to help the gentleman; for it will help him in no shape, if read any other way. But he does not say so. How does the passage read? "I said in mine heart God *shall* judge the righteous and the wicked." God shall, in the *future*, judge this world, and decide eternally the case of each according to his works here—"for there is a time for every purpose and for every work."

And as corroborative proof of my position, and to correct the gentleman's misapplication of the text, see Heb. ix. 27—"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." To settle the fact, that the judgment is future and not in this world, the inspired writer has fixed its time *after death*. And this, as Dr. Clarke tells us, is to be understood literally in reference to death in this world and final retribution in the future world. So much for his counter proof.

A word with reference to his comments on the text we quoted from 2 Cor. v. 10. On this he censures the translators. I was aware that he would try to get away from the Book, or impugn its authority. We thought quite likely he will find this Scripture very much in his way. He tells us that our Baptist friends have found it necessary, on account of the many defects in the Bible, to make a new translation; and he gave as an instance of its defects, the word *baptism*, which should be *immersion*. But this is not a defect in translation—for the word is not translated but transferred from the original; and our Baptist brethren have seen fit to translate it. It is conceded by all able critics, that the defects in our common translation are very slight.

But let us read this passage, leaving out the italicised words: "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ"—(this he admits is a universal judgment, and he will not deny that Christ is the judge)—"that every one may receive the things in *body*, according to that he

hath done, whether good or bad." Well, leaving out the words in italics, which we do not object to, it reads that men, in the judgment, shall receive in their bodies the things, the treatment or decision that shall accord with what they did in the state of trial in the flesh, in this world. And what are the facts in the case? Why, the trump of God shall sound, and the dead shall be raised, shall come forth with their resurrection bodies, and shall be judged and receive their final retribution of rewards and punishment according to their deeds done before death, in the very same bodies that are changed by the resurrection. This text is as the noon-day sun, without a cloud, in proof of our position.

A word in regard to his interpretation of the answer we gave him. He inquired if I believed the righteous and the wicked were rewarded in this world. Understanding him to mean rewarded in the *highest sense* in which the Bible teaches rewards, we answered in the negative. We hold that men are under God's moral government here, and in a state of trial, and as such, He blesses, comforts, chastises, or punishes men here, according to the principles of His government and the moral character and condition of man in a state of probation for the future world. We believe, too, that individuals as well as nations become so abandoned in crime, as to make it necessary for God to come out in judgment, and sorely afflict, or cut them off from the earth. But all this is not the final retribution, that fixes man's destiny for eternity.

We now adduce additional proof. And we lay down this rule: Any interpretation of the word of God that contradicts matters of fact, and the general tenor of the holy Scriptures, must absolutely be false, and should be rejected. And we hold that the gentleman's interpretation of the *judgment*, making it *progressive*, stands out in bold opposition to matters of fact, and contradicts the general tenor of the Scriptures.

The judgment he has admitted to be universal judgment, including the entire human race. And it cannot be past, for it then could not be a universal judgment, because it would exclude nations yet unborn. Then his position is

that it is progressive; that it commenced with the commencement of our race; that it has progressed with the progression of our race, and that it never will terminate till the termination of our race on earth. This position contradicts matters of fact, and the whole tenor of the Bible, and involves an absolute impossibility. If we prove this, his position goes to the winds of heaven.

I have proved to you that Jesus Christ is to be the judge in this universal judgment. And the gentleman has said, and for good reason, that he will not controvert this position. And his system maintains that Jesus Christ had no literal and personal being for about four thousand years of the world's history; that a little more than eighteen hundred years ago, he was born in the land of Judea, and that he had no personal existence till that time. Now it is absolutely impossible that a being who had no existence for four thousand years of the world's history, could have judged, at the time of their existence, those who lived during that time. Yet Mr. D. says the judgment commenced with the beginning of our race, and has been progressive ever since—and still, for four thousand years of this time the judge was not in existence.

Jesus Christ, as God manifest in the flesh, and Redeemer of the world, made his appearance 1800 years ago, and to say that he was a judge of the world, and decided the case of men for eternity before he redeemed the world, is a flat contradiction,

Again, it contradicts the whole tenor of the word of God. The Scriptures represent Jesus Christ as literally sitting in judgment in the case of every individual in the world, at the last day. Matt. xxv. 31—"When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." Again—Acts i. 9—11. "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven, as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Je-



sus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."

Here it is shown that Jesus Christ shall come as literally in the presence of all whom he is to judge, as he ascended up to heaven.

But he is to judge every one of our race. But he has never appeared in the case of every individual, for his appearing is to be literal, in glory, with all the holy angels with him; so that every person must know when he comes. It follows then that he has not yet judged the world, and the gentleman's position is wholly wrong.

[Time expired.]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S NINTH REPLY.]

I want you my friends, to bear in mind, the points at issue between my friend and myself. The position he has taken this morning is, that the Scriptures teach a universal judgment. This I have admitted. But still he thought fit to prove that this judgment is to be executed by Jesus Christ. I have admitted this also. But he claims that he has proved by his Scripture quotations that this judgment executed upon all men will take place in the future world. Now I deny that the Scriptures he has quoted proves any such thing. I have showed that the day God has appointed, in which to judge the world in righteousness, is the Gospel day—that it commenced with the Gospel dispensation, and would continue to its end, embracing the whole mediatorial reign of Jesus Christ. And in proof of this position I quoted. "Now is the judgment of *this* world, now shall the prince of *this* world be judged;" and stated that this was in accordance with the declaration of the prophet who says. "He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he shall have set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law." Now let it be distinctly understood that the Gospel day, is the day of God's judgment of the world by Jesus Christ, and that this judgment is confined to this world. I have shown from the very passage (2 Cor. v. 10,) our friend brought forward to prove the universality of the judgment, or rather Paul shows,

that we are to receive the things in the body, in this world according to that we have done. And our friend in attempting to do away the power of my argument made a complete failure.

He says on this text. "Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the prince of this world be judged," that this has reference to the world judging Jesus Christ, and not to Christ as judging the world. The gentleman had just been telling us that Jesus Christ would judge the world, and now turns right about and tells us that this is the world judging Jesus Christ ! I would thank him for a little more light on the subject. Where does he find that this world is to judge Jesus Christ ? It may however be the best turn and twist he could give it. And I hope that he will come to the conclusion the sign "*All kinds of twisting and turning done here,*" is now at his door, and not over mine.

Again: I want to call the attention of our friend, once more to Eccl. iii. 16, 17, I quoted this text and others to show that the judgment is in this world. And if this text does not prove my position, then proof of any position cannot be brought from the Bible. "And moreover I saw under the sun the place of judgment, that wickedness was there; and the place of righteousness, that iniquity was there." Now there are two distinct propositions in this text. First it is positively asserted, that the place of judgment is *under the sun*. And secondly it is asserted, as a reason why it is under the sun, that wickedness and righteousness are there. It is necessary that the judgment should be where the wickedness and the righteousness are. The writer furthermore asserts, to show the judgment takes place under the sun. That, "there is a time there (under the sun) for every purpose and for every work." If there be a time for *every purpose* and for *every work*, then there is a time there for the *judgment* likewise.

You will remember that our friend, when I asked for his opinion, said he did not believe that this world was a state of retribution of rewards and punishments. He said also, that the sinner was not punished in this life, but

was reserved for the future world. I then adduced some plain passages simply to prove that there is a God that *judgeth in the earth*, and that he has established his *judgment* in the earth, that righteousness was rewarded *here* and wickedness punished *here in the earth*.

The gentlemen saw that I had proved this, and he began to back out of his position, by saying that the crimes of individuals and nations, might be so great, that God may punish them in this world. But I am not going to let him off so easy—God has established the fact that this world is the place of retribution. And the experience of the world, and the history of our race go to establish the fact that there is a God that *judgeth in the earth*.

What saith the Bible? Prov. xi. 31. "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner." Now this Scripture is true or it is false. But if the position that our friend takes, in reference to the judgment, be true, then this language of the Bible is false, for it sayeth that the present is not a state of retribution. And the words of the wise man are to be taken before our friend's.

As additional proof of our position we quote from the Bible. "The way of the transgressor is hard."

Now if the way of the transgressor was peaceful and calm, I would admit that he was not punished in this world for his sins. But Solomon tells us that the way of the transgressor is *hard*. The Prophet tells us, "the wicked are like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waters casteth up mire and dirt." "There is no peace saith my God to the wicked."

Now you see in the world, confirmation of this truth. The reward of the righteous is peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. We see that indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, is upon every soul of man that doeth evil of the Jew first and also of the Gentile, for there is no respect of persons with God.

But when does all this take place? in the future world? No, but in this world. Now it is strange that our friend does not see this, and stranger still that he should take a position that is controverted by all enlightened orthodox

theologians in Christendom. I do not say that the Calvinistic divines admit that the present is fully a state of retribution—that the righteous is fully rewarded here—or the wicked fully punished; but they admit that such is the fact in part.

[MR. POWER'S TENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators.*—A few passing remarks on his last speech. He does not deny, he says, that there is to be a universal judgment. But this judgment means the Gospel-day. And here we ask him, does the Gospel-day go back before the birth of Christ in this world? [Mr. Doolittle replied, that he held that Christ was slain from the foundation of the world.] Well, we are at an important point, which perhaps might as well be settled now.—To do this, we propose a few questions, which only require an answer, yes, or no. [Mr. Doolittle here stated again his reservation, that he did not feel bound to answer every question directly.] We recollect his reservation, that he is not bound to answer questions he knows nothing about. But the questions to be proposed are in point in his system, and which he doubtless is prepared to answer. And mark, when we speak of Jesus-Christ, we include his entire character as revealed in the Bible. And by his works we include all that he has done as the Savior of sinners.

I now ask the gentleman if he believes that Jesus Christ, by all that he has done and suffered from the foundation of the world, redeems man from the danger of eternal punishment in the future world? [Mr. Doolittle answered emphatically, No.] This is a distinct answer; and we hope all will remember it. Does Jesus Christ, in all he has done and suffered for our race, redeem and save man from the punishment of his sins in this world? [Mr. Doolittle replied—"No, not at all. He did not come for that purpose; he came to save men from their sins, and not from the danger of punishment for their sins."] Well that is a plain answer. I have but one more question to ask him under this head. Does his system hold that Jesus

Christ possesses an unoriginated and Divine nature? [Mr. Doolittle replied that this question had to do with the doctrine of the Trinity, but nothing to do with the discussion.] The gentleman refuses to answer the question. I have a right to require an answer, but will waive it.—This point, frequently stated during the discussion, is now settled; that is, that Jesus Christ, according to Mr. D's position, is in no sense a Savior from the punishment due to sin in this, or the future world; and that if he is a Savior at all, it must be from the commission and practice of sin in this world. But that he does not save all men from the practice of sin in this world, was fully shown by Mr. D. himself in his last speech, in the case of the antediluvians, and others since the flood. Hence, if Jesus Christ does not save men from the practice and the punishment of sin in this nor the future world, he does not save them at all, and consequently he is absolutely rejected by the gentleman from being a Savior. Our friend, in trying to escape a difficulty, brought up the case of the Sodomites, to prove that retribution takes place in this world. They were too wicked to live on the earth, and God came down in wrath, and in an awful manner hurried them into eternity. Now if they were too corrupt to live on the earth, where did they go to? Were they taken to heaven?

A word on his remarks upon our answer to his question: Does God judge men in this or in the future world? This we explained before, by stating that the term *judgment* is used in various senses in the Bible. First—His law as a rule of faith to man in this world. Second—It means God's universal administration in his kingdom of providence and grace, by which he inflicts punishments and bestows blessings on individuals and nations in this world, but not the final retributions of eternity. Hence the gentleman's illustrations in the case of the antediluvians, the Sodomites and the Jews, are in perfect accordance with our views, as expressed when on the floor before. And we maintain that these are not the final retributions which they will receive at the bar of God.

[Mr. Doolittle here arose and said he wanted definitely

to understand the gentleman, and put the question directly, whether he believed that the sinner was punished for sin in this world? Mr. Power replied that this would not admit of a direct answer; said that he had stated that God punished men for their sins in this world, but not finally. Mr. Doolittle then emphatically repeated his question, to which Mr. Power replied—"Partially."]

This is precisely the same position occupied when I first answered the question. I was explaining the use of the term *judgment*. A third use of the term—It means the final judgment at the winding up of all sublunary affairs, when God will fix man's destiny to all eternity, according to the moral character with which he left this world. This was my answer to his first question. You recollect his last speech was based wholly on the ground that I deny all interference of God to punish individuals or nations in this world. But in this he made my position for me, and brought all his strength down like an avalanche on a position of his own imagination.

On Prov. xi. 31. "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner." This declaration is in perfect harmony with our views, as we have explained them. The man who lives in sin and guilt, deprives himself of the love and favor of God, lives under his displeasure, and is an unhappy man; while the truly pious man, who spends his life in serving God, is happy while he lives, and he dies in peace. This is what we understand the text to mean, and that it says nothing about the final retribution.

But once more: The text either includes all that God intends to do for the righteous or the wicked, or it does not. There is no sophistry in this statement; and the consequences cannot be avoided. If he says it does not include all God intends to do for the righteous or the wicked, he gives up his ground. And there is no alternative but to take the other horn of the dilemma—that this text states all that God intends to do for the righteous or the wicked in time or in eternity. If he contends that the righteous will be more happy in the future world than in

this, or the wicked more miserable, then this is only a partial retribution. But if he takes the opposite ground, he has to tell the righteous that they are, *in this world*, in all the heaven they will ever enjoy.

For the principle which this text recognizes, and which cannot be overthrown, is, if the sinner receives *in this world* all the *punishment* that the Bible threatens—on the same principle, the righteous will receive and enjoy, *in this world*, all the happiness that the Bible promises. So if the gentleman's position be true, that this text teaches a *full* and not a *partial* retribution, it is of no consequence whether the pious stay in this world or go to heaven.—Such are some of the glaring absurdities involved in attempting to confine the final judgment to this world.

[*Thirty minutes not all occupied. Adjourned.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S TENTH REPLY.]

I want now to have you bear in mind the positions we occupy at this stage of the debate. In the former part of the day our friend Power labored to prove a general judgment in the future world. He quoted several texts to prove it; but unfortunately for him every text he has quoted fails to answer his purpose. One passage which he supposes proves a future judgment, which we have not noticed is recorded in Heb. ix. 27. "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." Now my friends there is nothing more clear, from the context than that this passage has no reference to the condition of man in the future world. The Apostle is here contrasting the legal dispensation and the priesthood of Aaron with its rites and ceremonies and offices, with the Christian dispensation and the priesthood of Christ. Hence it has no reference to a future state at all. And the death here spoken of has no reference to a natural death. But it has reference to the death which the priests under the law figuratively died in the sacrifice or atonement which he made for the people. It was customary for the priests, once a year, to enter into the holy of holies to make atonement for the sins of the whole house of Israel. And when he en-

tered this place, he bore on his breast the breast plate of judgment, which had inscribed in it names of the twelve tribes of Israel. On the border of his garments were little bells. After he had made the atonement, and the sacrifice was accepted, then came the decision or judgment. The term *judgment* here in the text means decision. To make known to the people that the atonement was made and the sacrifice accepted, and the high priest yet lived, he gave a sound with the bells on the border of his garment, and on hearing it the whole camp of Israel gave a shout of joy. Now this atonement was a type of the general atonement which was made by Jesus Christ, for the sins of the whole world. So says the Apostle here. "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." As it is appointed unto men once to die under the figure of sacrifice, referring to the atonement made by the high priest, and after this the decision. So Christ was once offered for the sins of the whole world, and thus, as it was with the high priest, it shall be announced that this sacrifice is accepted, the atonement made *for the whole world*, and Jesus Christ the great high priest still lives, to make intercession for us. Thus you see this text affords our friend no support to his position.

He has quoted, to prove that the judgment is in the future world, Matt. xxv. 31. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory:" Now when is this to take place? Is it at the end of time? Or has it reference to Christ's coming figuratively to judgment in this world? I take the position that it has no reference to the future world. It is true we read that Christ shall come in the glory of his Father with his holy angels, and that he shall reward every man according to his works. But the time of his coming is definitely fixed by Christ himself, Matt. xvi, 27—28. "For the son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you. There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." This shows conclusively, that the judgment



is to take place in *this world*, and *not* in a *future world*; for it is here said that it is to take place during the life-time of some that were then present.

I hope, after this, that our friend Power will not contend further for a future judgment when Christ says that it commenced nearly eighteen hundred years ago.

We want you to bear in mind that we have put the veto of annihilation on our friends system. We have admitted the universality of the judgment, and have shown where this judgment is to take place. We have proved that the judgment is in this world, where wickedness and righteousness are. This is according to reason and our own experience, and the words of inspiration which teaches that there is a God that "judgeth in the earth," and "Now is the judgment of this world." I proved from 2 Cor. v. 10. "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things in body, according to that he hath done, whether *it be* good or bad." For he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man (Jesus Christ) whom he hath ordained, and this day is the Gospel day, embracing the whole extent of the mediatorial reign of Christ, from the commencement of our race, to the final consummation of all things, when Christ himself shall become subject to the Father, that God may be all in all. The result of this judgment will be the rewarding of every man according to his works, the destruction of sin, bringing in everlasting righteousness, fitting souls for the indwelling of the holy spirit of God. Hence let us rejoice in view of this glorious event.

Now as farther proof that the judgment is in this world, that men are punished here for their sins. I will quote Heb. ii. 1—3. "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let *them* slip. For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great a salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard *him*." This shows that this

world is a state of retribution where every transgression and disobedience shall receive a just recompense of reward. The Apostle says, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?"

Again: I quote 1st Peter iv. 15—18. "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or *as* a thief, or *as* an evil-doer, or as a busy-body in other men's matters. Yet if *any man* suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf. For the time *is come* that judgment must begin at the house of God; and if it first *begin* at us, what shall the end *be* of them that obey not the Gospel of God? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?"

Now take notice that Peter tells us that eighteen hundred years ago, the time had come when judgment must begin at the house of God. And yet our friend tells us that it is yet future. But mark, it was to begin with *them*, with *him*, and those to whom he was writing. And, my friends, you should remember that this has no reference to the future world. When we get home to heaven, we will not have to say we were *scarcely saved*. That will be a salvation to all intents and purposes.

But the salvation here spoken of, in connection with the judgment, was a salvation from the judgment that was about to come on the Jewish nation, and from it they would scarcely be saved. This judgment is spoken of in Matth. xxiv. The city of Jerusalem was to be destroyed, and the Jews to be dispersed among all nations of the earth, and there was to be great tribulation, such as had not been from the beginning of the world to that time, and never should be again. This day of vengeance was at hand when Peter wrote, and from it the righteous would scarcely be saved. How were they saved!—Jerusalem was encompassed with the Roman army, under Titus, who pressed the siege so close that there seemed no way for escape for any one in the city. But the news reached Titus that his father, Vespasian, was dangerously sick, and he went immediately to Rome. And the Roman army withdrew for a time from the siege. It was during this time that the Christians left the city and es-

escaped to places of safety. Thus you see they were *scarcely* saved; for Titus immediately returned and pressed the siege with renewed vigor, and thousands were destroyed by famine, pestilence, and the sword, and the remainder were carried away and sold into bondage. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Judges and the Congregation.*—It cannot have escaped your notice, the great embarrassment under which my worthy respondent labored in his last speech.—He was completely in the fog during his whole effort. But we call him back to his proof text—Prov. xi. 31—"Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner;" and remark that according to my friend's favorite author, Dr. Clarke, the passage in Pet., translated, "And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" is a transcript from the Septuagint translation of Prov. xi. 31. And the literal translation of the Hebrew, he says, is, "Behold, to the righteous it shall be returned on the earth; and also to the wicked and the transgressor."

You recollect the dilemma made for the gentleman on this text: That it either includes all the rewards of the righteous, and all the punishment of the wicked, or it does not. And you have observed that in his last speech he kept as far from it as possible. If he maintains that it teaches the final retribution of the righteous and the wicked, then the righteous will have all their happiness in this world, and the sinner all his punishment—then heaven is no better place for the christian than this world.

On 1 Peter iv. 18, Mr. D. has given a perfect refutation of himself. He has proved with entire clearness that Peter was speaking of a *particular judgment*, while the point at issue is a *general judgment*. This has saved us the time of evincing that fact.

He quoted Heb. ii. 1—3, . . . . "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" &c. The Apostle is here contrasting their condition under the Christian dispensation with the condition of those under the Jewish dis-

penation. And says, if those under the Jewish dispensation, who had much fewer privileges than we have, were sorely punished for every act of disobedience, how can we, who have so many privileges, escape the retributions of eternity, if we neglect so great salvation—the whole system of Christianity?

He says, Heb. ix. 27, "And as it is appointed unto men once to die; and after this the judgment," has no reference to the future world, and the death spoken of does not mean the literal death of the body. But we have the gentleman's distinguished author, Dr. Clarke, to sustain our views on this. A word in reference to Mr. D.'s interpretation. Two or three assumptions give it all the plausibility it has; and unfortunately for him, these are made in the face of stubborn facts to the contrary, and they contradict the very letter of the text. First, he says the high priest under the Jewish law, figuratively died for the sins of the people. We deny that in any place in the Scriptures, it is intimated that the high priest was to die, literally, figuratively, spiritually, or in any other sense, for the people. The gentleman's assumption is false, and unfounded on the word of God, from centre to circumference. It was the business of the high priest to enter the sanctuary once a year, not to die figuratively, but to sacrifice a victim, an animal, which literally died, typifying the death of Jesus Christ.

But did this take place but *once* in the lifetime of the high priest? We are told it took place *annually*. Now the text says, "as it is appointed unto men *once* to die,"—*once only*, in the case of men. But it was the business of the high priest to offer his victim *once* every year. This text then, we maintain, gives literal matters of fact; for we know it is appointed unto men *once*, and only *once*, to die.

The point between us is, whether the literal judgment of men takes place in this world or in the future world. To have this point settled with a clearness beyond doubt, we give you some clear cases.

We quote first from Job iv. 7. 9; where the issue is fairly joined between Job and his friends. Job's friends main-

tained that God punished every act of wickedness in this world, and that the righteous were rewarded in this world. This position they kept through the whole discussion. Job contended with his friends on this point. The reading of several passages will make this question as clear as the sun, and settle it beyond a doubt. Eliphaz speaks in this passage, "Remember I pray thee, whoever perished being innocent? or where were the righteous cut off? Even as I have seen, they that plow iniquity, and sow wickedness, reap the same. By the blast of God they perish and by the breath of his nostrils are they consumed." This is the very position my respondent maintains--the very doctrine he insists on.

I read the 20th and 21st verses of the same chapter--"They are destroyed from morning to evening: they perish forever, without any regarding it: Doth not their excellency which is in them go away? they die even without wisdom." He is here speaking of the wicked, and speaks of the manner they are dealt with, to prove that God recompenses men in this world according to their works. The same position is taken by another of Job's friends in the 8th chap. 1-6 verses: "Then answered Bildad the Shuite, and said, how long wilt thou speak these things? and how long shall the words of thy mouth be like a strong wind? Doth God pervert judgment? or doth the Almighty pervert justice? If thy children have sinned against him, and he have cast them away for their transgression; If thou wouldst seek unto God betimes, and make thy supplication to the Almighty; if thou wert pure and upright; surely now he would awake for thee, and make the habitation of thy righteousness prosperous." Holding the doctrine that the world is the place for the retribution of the righteous and the wicked, Bildad here charges Job with suffering for his wickedness.

Again: Job. xi. 1-6. "Then answered Zophar the Naamathite, and said, should not the multitude of words be answered? and should a man full of talk be justified? should thy lies make men hold their peace? and when thou mockest, shall no man make thee ashamed? for thou has said, my doctrine is pure, and I am clean in thine eyes. But

oh that God would speak, and open his lips against thee; and that he would shew thee the secrets of wisdom, that they are double to that which is! Know, therefore, that God exacteth of thee less than thine iniquity deserveth." This passage clearly sets forth the doctrine maintained by my respondent, to wit: that God judges and fully recompenses every man on the earth—the righteous are made happy, and the wicked punished *in this state of being*, instead of being held responsible to a *future judgment*. But hear what Job says, Job vi. 1—4. "But Job answered and said, oh that my grief were thoroughly weighed, and my calamities laid in a balance together! for now it would be heavier than the sand of the sea; therefore my words are swallowed up. For the arrows of the Almighty are within me, the poison whereof drinketh up my spirit: the terrors of God do set themselves in array against me." Mark here, that Job so far from maintaining that the righteous are fully rewarded in this world, speaks as if overwhelmed with grief for his unparalleled calamities. And Job ix. 22—25. "This one thing, therefore I said it, He destroyeth the perfect and the wicked. If the scourge slay suddenly, he will laugh at the trial of the innocent. The earth is given into the hand of the wicked: he covereth the faces of the judges thereof; if not, where and who is he? Now my days are swifter than a post: they flee away, they see no good." Job xii. 1—6. "And Job answered and said, no doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you. But I have understanding as well as you; I am not inferior to you: yea, who knoweth not such things as these? I am as one mocked of his neighbor, who calleth upon God, and he answereth him: the just upright man is laughed to scorn. He that is ready to slip with his feet is as a lamp despised in the thought of him that is at ease. The tabernacles of robbers prosper, and they that provoke God are secure; into whose hand God bringeth abundantly." Mark the issue is joined as clear as the sun, on the same ground my friend occupies against me.

Again: Job xvi. 11—15. "God hath delivered me to the ungodly, and turned me over into the hands of the

wicked. I was at ease, but he hath broken me assunder, he hath also taken me by my neck, and shaken me to pieces, and set me up for his mark. His archers compass me round about; he cleaveth my reins asunder, and doth not spare; he poureth out my gall upon the ground. He breaketh me with breach upon breach; he runneth upon me like a giant, I have sewed sackcloth upon my skin, and defiled my horn in the dust." Here Job, notwithstanding his integrity and righteousness, says that he is given over into the hands of the ungodly, and is most sorely afflicted.

Here the doctrine maintained by those three men who entered the arena against Job is, that this world is the state of final retribution; all the wicked are here punished according to their crimes, and the innocent and holy always escape punishment or afflictions and are fully rewarded in this life. But Job maintains that the wicked, so far from being fully punished in this world, are greatly prospered and every thing around them ministered to their happiness; while on the other hand the righteous are sometimes sorely oppressed and afflicted.

The gentleman you know, here takes the ground that the present is the period of full and final retribution for the wicked and the righteous. This we deny and hold that it is a period of mixed retribution, and the final decision is left for the general judgment in the future world: And we think we can settle our position by authority, that will place it beyond controversy. Job i. 8. "And the Lord said unto Satan, hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil?" Again, Job ii. 3. "And the Lord said unto Satan, hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him on the earth, a perfect and upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil? and still he holdeth fast his integrity, although thou movedst me against him, to destroy him without cause." Here the piety and uprightness of Job and his entire devotion to his creator, is attested by his Divine maker.

To settle the point at issue between Job and his friends,

and likewise the same point between me and my worthy friend, I refer you to the authority of God himself for decision, as recorded in the 42d chapter of Job from the 7th to the 10th verses inclusive. "And it was so, that after the Lord had spoken these words unto Job, the Lord said to Eliphaz the Temanite, my wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends; for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath. Therefore take unto you now seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt-offering; and my servant Job shall pray for you, for him will I accept; lest I deal with you after your folly, in that ye have not spoken of me the thing which is right, like my servant Job. So Eliphaz the Temanite, and Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite, went and did according as the Lord commanded them: the Lord also accepted Job. And the Lord turned the captivity of Job, when he prayed for his friends; also the Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before." Here the Lord specifically condemned what the friends of Job had said in regard to His character and administration.

What had they said? Why that this was the period of final retribution—that the righteous and wicked are here fully rewarded according to their works. God was angry with them for misrepresenting *Him*,—"ye have not spoken of *Me* the thing that is right."

Job contended that the present was not the time for final retribution, that the righteous and wicked are not rewarded here according to their deeds; and God testifies of Job that he had "said the things that were right," and accepted of him and heard his prayer.

Here then we see that Jehovah—if his decision is to be regarded in the premises—settles this question beyond the possibility of a doubt, that the final judgment, the final rewards of the righteous, and the final punishment of the wicked are reserved for the future world.

My time is up, but I will just add, that till my respondent meets this position fairly all he may say on this question will scarcely deserve a word of notice.



## [MR. DOOLITTLE'S ELEVENTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators and the Audience.*—I am as much at a loss what to do as in the former part of the day, when the gentleman gave us a speech, in which there was nothing to meet. He has made a great effort to prove something from the case of Job; but it proves just nothing at all, or proves just the contrary of what he wished to prove, it teaches that the wicked are punished in this world.

I am at a loss for what purpose my friend brought this, and if he will be so good now as to inform us before we go further, it will help us.

[Mr. Power replied at length: "Gentlemen Judges, you will recollect I had been adducing proof that the final judgment of men is yet future, and takes place, as I have proved from the Book, after death. The gentleman takes exceptions to this, and said the final judgment takes place in this world. I brought up the case from Job, as a perfect illustration of the question. In this case, the three friends of Job maintained that the wicked are fully punished in this world for their wickedness, and the righteous fully rewarded in this world for their righteousness.—This they maintained through the discussion, and this is precisely the ground my worthy respondent occupies.—On the other hand, Job maintained that the wicked are not fully punished in this world, but frequently live in ease and prosperity; and that the righteous are frequently cast down, and lose their children and property, and health; and are subject to the greatest calamities in this world.

Again: I referred to the decision of God on this point. He tells us his wrath was kindled against the friends of Job, because they had misrepresented God, and he approved of Job, because he had spoken the truth.

This is as clear as I can make it, and if my friend is so much in the fog that he cannot see the force of it, I know the congregation can see it." ]

Gentlemen, as for the fog, I see my way clear, and I am

not bewildered at all. My chart and compass are not lost yet. I have not been in the fog since the discussion commenced. But the veil is over our friend's mind, and the beam is in his eye. If he will cast out the beam he will see clearly, whether I am in the fog or not.

But I thank the gentleman for his kindness in giving us the explanation, for I was in the dark to know what his object was in bringing up this case—but after some minutes he has explained it—and now it is not very clear. But if I understand him rightly, he made the quotation from the book of Job, to prove that the wicked are not punished in this world, and that the righteous are not rewarded here according to their works.

If this is the right understanding of the matter, he has been laboring for some time to array Scripture against Scripture. Now, if he can make one passage teach one thing and another teach just the opposite, he will be in no better condition than he thinks I am in. We will all be involved together. If the Bible is at war with itself it will be destroyed. Our friend has been taking a course, not with a view to destroy your confidence in the Bible, but a course which will destroy all confidence in the word of God. Now general truths are laid down in the Bible. They are not true, merely because they are in the Bible, but because they are in accordance with the nature and relation of things, and the finger of infinite wisdom has written them on every page of the great volume of nature spread out before us, and the great truth, which wholly annihilates the position of our friend, and which is written every where in the volume of nature, and on almost every page of the Bible, and is in accordance with our reason is, that there is a God who *judgeth in the earth*; and that the violation of both physical and moral law, will be visited with a penalty, corresponding with such violation, and that the penalty will be visited on us immediately. This, all know to be the fact, with the violation of physical law, that the penalty immediately follows; and this law holds equally true in the moral world, as speedily and as certainly, as the thunder follows the lightning. So every violation of moral law is followed by its full penalty.—

Hence, nature and revelation unite in declaring that the "righteous shall be recompensed *in the earth*, much more the wicked and the sinner. And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and sinner appear." If these passages both mean the same thing, as we have been informed, then both prove that the righteous shall be judged and recompensed in the earth, and much more the unrighteous and the sinner. Now, are we to set aside all these principles and truths of nature and reason, which would remain for ever true, did not the Bible exist?

It comports with man's experience, that every violation of natural and physical law will be visited with its due penalty, and that its retribution is not far off in the future world.

And, likewise, that as certain as effect and cause are united, so sure will those who violate the moral precepts, suffer the penalty of such violation.

"There is no peace," saith my God, "to the wicked," this would be eternally true, had the Almighty never uttered it. But how is it with the righteous? "He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither, and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper; the path of the just is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day. Wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace."

"The work of righteousness is peace, and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance for ever." Now, the truth of these declarations is corroborated by nature and reason, and the experience of the whole world.

As farther proof of the great principle that the righteous and the wicked are recompensed in the earth, according to their works, see Prov. xii. 12, 13. "The wicked desireth the net of evil *men*; but the root of the righteous yieldeth *fruit*. The wicked is snared by the transgression of *his* lips: but the just shall come out of trouble."

Again: Jer. ix. 23, 24. "Thus saith the Lord, let not the wise *man* glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty *man* glory in his might, let not the rich *man* glory in his riches: but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he

standeth and knoweth me, that I *am* the Lord which is loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness, in earth: for in these *things* I delight, saith the Lord." , you see, is another testimony explicit that the judgment is *in the earth* and not in the future world, as our Lord would have you believe. But I will now call your attention to the words of Solomon, who was as wise and as good as Job. In Prov. xi. 30, 31, he tells us—"The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life; and he that winneth it is wise. Behold, the wise shall be recompensed in earth: much more the wicked and the sinner." And in the next chapter you may read, if you choose, from the first verse to the end of the chapter, for it all teaches the same doctrine; but I will quote only the last verse. "In the way of righteousness is life; and in the pathway thereof is no death." And this harmonizes with the declaration—"The work of righteousness shall be peace, and the effects of righteousness, quietness and assurance for ever." The wise man tells us that life (everlasting life, as our Savior says,) is the way of righteousness—the right way—reap peace and joy—this is *always* his fruit. On the other hand, death is in the way of the wicked, "The way of the transgressor is hard." "The wicked are like the churning of the sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked."

I might quote many other passages in support of my position, but I think these are sufficient. However, I will quote some more passages to show you that the place where God metes out punishments and rewards, is in this world. First—Rom. v. 18. "Therefore, as by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation—even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Now, here is universal judgment for sin of all men; and it is repeated as having already come in the past. Again: 1 Cor. ix. 30. "And Jesus said, for judgment I am come into this world, &c." Now, Christ does not say he has come into this world for judgment in the future world, but

for judgment here; this was the object of his mission—what he came for.

I want you, my friends, to understand, that my friend Power is the one in the fog instead of myself; and, as an evidence of this fact, I wish to remind you that he has once or twice taken a position and abandoned it. You will recollect that I put the question to him in the former part of the day, whether he believed the present world was a place of retribution—that God metes out rewards and punishments here to men; and he answered, unqualifiedly, that he did not. Afterwards, he abandoned his position in part, and said he did believe that, partially, this is a world of retribution—that is, that some nations and individuals, because of their great crimes and wickedness, were partially punished in this world, but not fully.—Now, first, his position, unqualifiedly, was, this world is not a state of retribution. His next position is, this world is a state of retribution, but not fully so. In this position he now stands before you. I will admit that this is not giving up the main position entirely, but it is conceding, in part, what I had proved—that this world is the place where God metes out rewards and punishments. On this text—"The righteous shall be recompensed in the earth"—he admits that this is a recompense in part, but not in full.

"Now, to bring it to a point," he says, "either the righteous are wholly recompensed for their works in this world, or they are not. If they are not fully recompensed in this world, then it follows, that they are to be recompensed for their works, in the future world. But if they are fully recompensed in this world, then, this is the only Heaven there is for the righteous."

But this does not follow; it remains to be proved. I say this text says, and the Bible maintains, that the righteous shall be fully recompensed in this world. And if the gentleman will prove that the righteous are to be recompensed in the future world for deeds performed in this world, I will then yield my position. Now, as to the righteous in the future world, all they receive there is the gift of God, not of works. It is not bestowed as a reward for

their good deeds in this world. The child of God receives Heaven, and all the glories of it, as a free gift from God, not on the score of merit. Heaven, and its happiness, are not bestowed upon the righteous as a recompense.

And I challenge my friend to produce a solitary passage from the word of God, that proves that the righteous are to be recompensed in the future world, for their good works in this life.

I have now noticed all my friend's arguments, and I remark, if he brings no more stronger ones than he has done, we shall not have much to do.

As I have some time, now, I will define what I mean by the *devil*. You recollect I quoted 1st John iii. 8. and Heb. ii. 14; which speaks of the destruction of the devil and his works.

Now, I simply say, that by the devil, here spoken of, I understand—"the spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience"—the adversary of souls, the source or fountain of moral corruption and sin; not a created, personal being, that was once an angel of light in Heaven, and was cast down to hell, and is now going about the earth tempting men to sin, every where, and leading them from the path of duty.

Our friend may talk as much as he pleases about a personal devil; he may describe him, with a body as large as ten thousand mammoths, and eyes like two blazing comets, and a tail that will draw after him a third part of the stars of heaven, and claim for him all the art, and cunning, and deceit, in the world; but I cannot believe in any such monster.

But what is to become of this devil, whatever he is?—The passages quoted, prove that he will be destroyed; likewise, that all his works will be destroyed. Now, some one has said that the devil is the Almighty's sheriff; and if the sheriff is destroyed, will not the prisoners escape? And if the devil is the keeper of the prison of hell, can any be kept in endless misery, if the devil and all his works are destroyed? The devil shall be destroyed. And do not be frightened, friends; for nothing good will be destroyed, but only evil, for it is the devil that harms men.

Now you all come here to get light. And if I can prove to you from the Scriptures, that the devil will be destroyed with all his works, and that joy and peace will pervade every breast of man, and that all will get to heaven, and be free from all evil and sorrow, and enjoy the favor of God for ever and ever, this will be a source of great rejoicing to us all. We could all rejoice in such a hope. It is a far better hope than our friend Power has. He is rejoicing, no doubt, in the thought that *some* will get home to heaven, where they will be eternally happy. But if he could see that *all* would be saved at last, he would have far greater joy. Now, his joy is limited. Then his joy would be unspeakable and full of glory. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S TWELFTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Judges.*—I have seen serious and grave subjects made the occasion of levity before. But in this I have no participation. I am transacting business for eternity. And if my position cannot be sustained without exciting the levity of a congregation, it must fail. My positions address themselves to the intelligence of the community—and consequently I cannot follow the gentleman in his witicisms.

In regard to his definition of the devil, we leave it till he will come out and tell us whether there is more than one devil, or whether he has a personal identity, or is only a corrupt nature in every man. I know that he felt his position was suffering here, or he would not have made the remarks he did. [Mr. Doolittle arose and said—"I will relieve the gentleman in a moment. I do not believe in any devil or devils aside from man in this world—something connected with men and women in this world."]  
Then I understand him to mean, that the devil is some propensity of man. [Mr. D.—"It is the spirit or principle of evil personified."] Has every individual of the human family this principle of evil in him? [Mr. D.—"Every one who is wicked."] Well, every one is wicked till he is changed; then till he is changed each individual has this devil in him. [Mr. D. said, "Yes, that is it."] Well,

gentlemen, you will recollect that the devil is the spirit or principle of evil personified. And that every individual that is wicked has such a devil in him. And every person that is tempted by the devil is tempted by this principle of evil in him: [Mr. D. responded, "Yes."] We have only to ask him to settle this in regard to the Savior on the mount. What kind of a principle of evil tempted Christ on the mount? Whether this principle had "wings or legs, or a body as large as a mountain, or what kind of a principle or creature" it was? Again, what principle of evil personified was it that entered into the swine, that caused "them to run violently down a steep place into the lake and were choked"? When he will settle these, we will give him other difficulties on this subject.

The gentleman charged me with changing my position. This we deny. He asked if I believed this world was a state of retribution, and if sinners were punished in this world for their sins? Understanding him to mean in the highest sense of retribution, I answered in the negative. He then gave *his* version of my answer, in which he misrepresented it. In my next speech I explained my meaning, which need not be repeated here. The audience understand it, if Mr. D. will not. We wonder much that the gentleman will continue to do himself such great discredit, by misrepresenting his opponent's views after he has been corrected so repeatedly. In this, however, he gives proof that he is sorely pressed by my *true* positions.

He says he will "yield his position" if I will adduce "a solitary passage" to prove that the righteous are recompensed, or rewarded, in the future world, for deeds performed in this. Before adducing this proof, we remind you of our *true* position on this subject, as repeatedly explained during this discussion—that is, that God requires of man, *not* works of *merit*, as a ground on which he can claim as a matter of *justice* a reward, *but*, works of *obedience*, as a *condition* on which God can bestow the rewards of Grace here, and of Glory in heaven.

Hence, when God rewards the righteous in heaven for their piety on earth, it is not because they have *merited* it by their works, but they have performed the works of obe-



dience as a *condition* on which God can bestow it as the free gift of grace. The proof—Matt. v. 11, 12. “Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.” Here Christ is explicit, and emphatic, in promising the righteous “a great reward in heaven.” On the ground of *merit*? No. Unconditionally? No. On what ground then? Why, on the ground of patient persevering obedience to Christ, continued in till death, as the *condition* of receiving the rewards of Grace on earth and Glory in heaven. And without which obedience there is no promise of salvation in time or in eternity. Will the gentleman meet this proof, or yield his position?

He attempted to illustrate the moral condition of man by physical law. He says if a man violates physical law the penalty immediately follows. For instance, if he puts his hand into the fire it will be burnt. So it will be, he says, in morals. If he violates the moral law the penalty will as surely and as speedily follow. Now taking the illustration—if an individual puts his hand into the fire, and lets it remain there, as men do in sinning against God, he experiences pain. But is this all? No; he loses his hand for life. So he puts out his eyes, and experiences pain at the time. But this is not all. He is blind for life. And so it is with sin. When a man sins, unless “his conscience is seared as with a hot iron,” he is convicted and feels guilt at the time on account of it. But so far from this being the final result, it follows him into eternity, unless he reforms and believes, and there settles his destiny forever.

Mr. D. attempted to excite your alarm, in reference to our quotations from Job, that it arrayed one part of the Bible against another part, and therefore invalidated the whole. But who does not know that the Bible, in its historical parts, records facts which are condemned by the Bible in other parts?

The Bible records the crucifixion of Christ. But does that part of the Bible advocate sin because it records such

a fact? It records the hypocrisy of the Pharisees—but does this give a sanction to hypocrisy? No, truly. So in the case before us; the Bible records the fact that the opposers of Job were in serious and alarming errors, and God condemns them for their errors. This is recorded, not to make the Bible contradict itself, but to show God's wrath against all such evil and erroneous doctrines, and misrepresentations of his character and government.

Again: to prove that the judgment is in this world, he quoted Rom. v. 18. "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation," &c. Well, if that is the final judgment, then saints and sinners are all condemned together, throughout all generations, for "the judgment came upon *all to condemnation*," and there is no salvation for any one. Truly, the gentleman is in great straights

But instead of meeting my argument from Job, he has not even noticed it. But it shall be kept before him. And I am satisfied this audience will not require me to notice any other argument of his in reference to a judgment in this world, till he meets this. And also, till he meets the difficulty raised against his application of Prov. xi. 31, and 1 Pet. ii. 18. Till he meets these arguments we shall not feel bound to pay any attention to any thing more that he may bring on this head.

As to the idea of a *progressive* judgment, it is an absurdity. First, on the ground that Jesus Christ is a mediator between God and man. "For," says Paul, "there is one God and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. ii. 5. Again, 1 Jno. ii. 1. "And if any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." We maintain that it is an absurdity which the Bible never could be the author of—that Christ can be the advocate with the Father on the throne, and at the very same time sit himself as a judge in the final judgment of our race. Gentlemen, could you be sitting there as judges in the case of an offender, and at the same time be here pleading his cause as advocates? This is an absurdity the Book of God never authorised or supported.

Again: it is an utter impossibility on the gentleman's

scheme. His system maintains that Jesus Christ, in the utmost dignity of his character and nature, is a finite and created being. We have this from Mr. Ballou, the apostle of the system.

It is absolutely impossible for a finite being to be in more than one place at the same time. I care not if it be Gabriel, or how great his capacities may be, if he is a created being, he is absolutely devoid of the attribute of Omnipresence. And if Christ is a created being, as his system teaches, he cannot be present now, judging every one, and at the same time be on the throne as mediator. If the doctrine of a progressive judgment be true, he is here, he is in London, in Paris, he is in Asia, and in Africa, and he is in every family on earth, as a judge, at the same moment of time. And yet he is a finite being literally in heaven!

This is just as impossible as for a worm that crawls in our path, to speak a universe into being. But the gentleman has to hold all these absurdities, if he holds to a progressive judgment.

He said he had examined all my proof texts. This is a mistake; but I attributed his want of memory to his great confusion and embarrassment; and will specify a text for him to notice. Acts i. 11. This shows that the coming of Christ shall be visible, when he comes in the glory of his Father and the holy angels with him, to judge the world.

Christ has never yet appeared thus visibly to the world to judge it. Consequently it is yet future. To show that the judgment has not taken place, and that it is yet future, see Rev. xx. 11. "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them."—And 2 Pet. iii. 5—13. "For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of

ungodly men. But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish; but that all should come to repentance. But the day of the Lord shall come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hastening unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire, shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

We have the authority of Dr. Clarke on these texts. I shall not quote his language. You can read for yourselves. He holds that these texts should be understood literally. The illustration that Peter uses is such as to require the text to be understood literally. As the old world was literally destroyed, so far as the element of water could destroy it, so the present world will literally be destroyed by fire.

Mr. D. may quote the prophets, to show that similar language is used figuratively. But if he does, it will be seen that the nature of the subjects adduced from prophecy, is such as to require the language to be understood figuratively. But in this case it is perfectly philosophical to understand the language literally.

You will bear in mind that the gentleman has admitted that the Bible teaches the doctrine of a universal judgment, and we have proved that the Bible makes this future.—And we have adduced facts connected with this judgment, that have never occurred in this world, and consequently must be future: For example, the coming of Christ in the manner described; and the passing away of the heavens and the earth, and the melting of the elements by fire.—

Our next item will be to show that God has connected the resurrection of the dead, both good and bad, with the literal coming of Jesus Christ, and the literal burning up of the material world. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S TWELFTH REPLY.]

*My Friends.*—I began to think, just now, that our friend was going to throw the laboring oars upon my hand entirely. He said that it devolved on me to show, from the passages in Peter and in Prov. whether the righteous were fully recompensed in this world or not. I did not suppose it devolved on me to prove both sides of the question. I had supposed it devolved on my friend to prove the affirmative. I thought he was to show that the righteous were not fully recompensed in the earth. But it appears that he has a hopeless task, and now he wants to throw the labor of this upon my shoulder. But I think I shall not go over to do this work for him. I know my business: it is to prove that the righteous are rewarded, and the wicked punished, in this world. Now I wish you to bear in mind, what our friend has been laboring all day to prove. He has not been trying to prove that any will be endlessly punished; but that they will be punished some in a future world; that the judgment will extend into the future world. But whether rewards of the righteous will be endless, or the punishment of the wicked eternal, he has said nothing about. And this is the real point in debate. So far from arriving to the point yet, he has not settled the preliminaries to it. What proof has he brought that there will be a judgment in the future world?

I have not seen a single particle of proof yet. He has said that our Savior has told us, *great will be your reward in heaven*. But I read, "*Great is your reward in heaven.*" Your reward is now in the kingdom great; you are now sitting down here with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven, enjoying your reward. Christ had told them if they would seek first the kingdom of heaven, that they should have joy and peace. All things they wanted should be added unto them. This they had done,

and now Christ could say, great is your reward in heaven—you are now enjoying your rewards. There is not the least reference to the future state—a state of immortality. And Christ says to the wicked and sinners around him—to those great sinners and hypocrites, the Pharisees “ye have your reward.” You now have your reward. Christ does not say they will have it in the future world, but tells them they have it now in this world.

Now with respect to this case of Job, I want to help the gentleman out of the fog in regard to this matter, that he may have no longer any excuse to remain where he is, but go on to some other proof. The learned who have investigated this matter most thoroughly, do not agree when or by whom, the book of Job was written. Some tell us it is a literal matter of fact, others an allegory. They have never been able to decide these questions. We believe, however, that it contains for us some important instruction. And be it an allegory or real history, it is intended no doubt to illustrate the dealings of God with his creatures on earth. In regard to the opinions of Job and his friends—which were correct? In the end God decides in favor of Job. But what ground did Job's friends take? Why that Job was one of the greatest of sinners, because he was so greatly afflicted. This, Job, all along, denies, and maintains his integrity and righteousness.—“I put on righteousness and it clothed me—my judgment was as a robe and a diadem—I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame—I was a father to the poor, and the cause which I knew not I searched out.”

This, Job continually maintained, notwithstanding his friends were all the time pressing him to come out and own that he was a great sinner and an arrant hypocrite. Now, who was right in the end? Why, God decides in favor of Job. It appears that these afflictions did not befall him in the providence of God, because Job was a wicked man, but as a trial of his faith and patience, for the purpose of doing him good, and in view of all his integrity, and the manner in which he endured these afflictions, his faithfulness was acknowledged and approved on the part of God, and his friends were condemned for judging

him as they did, and not saying the thing that was right. Now, on this point, was Job recompensed in this world or was he not? Why the truth is, as the history informs us, God blessed Job, and his last days were more prosperous and happy than the former part of his life. He was rewarded of God, according to his righteousness in this world.

Now I have disposed of this matter with respect to Job. As farther proof of the fact, that this is a world of retribution, I quote from *Psa. xcvi. 10—13*. "Say among the heathen, that the Lord reigneth: the world also shall be established that it shall not be moved: he shall judge the people righteously. Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fullness thereof.—Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein: then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord: for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth: he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth." Now, in view of God's moral government being set up and established in the earth; and in view of the commencement of the reign or day of judgment, the Psalmist calls upon all animate nature to rejoice before the Lord, for he cometh. Cometh for what? To judge the earth. When? In an immortal state of existence? No, here in this world. Again, *Psa. xcvi. 7—9*. "Let the sea roar, and the fullness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein. Let the floods clap their hands: let the hills be joyful together before the Lord: for he cometh to judge the earth: with righteousness shall he judge the world, and the people with equity." Now in view of this judgment, we are called upon to rejoice, all heaven and earth, and all the animate creation are called upon to rejoice, because the result of the judgment shall be glorious. But our friend Power will try to make out that the result of the judgment will be such as to clothe the heavens in blackness, and the earth in gloom, and drive its inhabitants to despair. Now if the Psalmist had viewed such to be the results of the judgment, would he have called upon all nature to rejoice on account of it? No, indeed, he would not. Remember his views of the judgment, and of its results, was very different from the opinion our friend has of it.

Now, to the gentleman's proof text. I am glad he has given one proof text. He tells us the coming of Christ to judge the world will be visible—that he is to come in like manner as he ascended into heaven. But my friends I have already settled this matter. I have shown you that the coming of Christ to judge the world took place during the lifetime of some of those to whom he was talking on earth. “For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his father with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.” Our friend quotes Peter, and I want you to pay particular attention to this testimony. 2 Peter iii. 7—13. “But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long suffering to us ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness. Looking for and hastening unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.”

Now my friends, I would remark that some of the most eminent commentators of the Bible are with me in understanding this passage. [Mr. Power requested him to name them.] I could mention several, but as I have not the authorities with me, I choose not to mention them, without being certain. But whatever may be the opinion of oth-



ers, I give it as my opinion, and I think the evidence is clear that the earth here referred to, is not the literal earth. It is to be understood in a figurative and moral sense, having reference to the removal of the Jewish dispensation, preparatory to the establishment of the New or Gospel dispensation. The same event is referred to in Heb. xii. 26—28. "Whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, yet once more, signifieth the removing those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear." This passage I give to illustrate the quotation of our friend from Peter to show it is to be understood in a figurative sense, and not literal—that it has reference to the abolishment of the legal dispensation, and establishment of the Gospel dispensation. This voice of God shook the Jewish dispensation and made it tremble and give way for the Gospel dispensation to be established. This is what is meant by the first heavens and earth passing away. The event which should close up the legal dispensation. And the result of this closing up of the legal dispensation, should be a day of judgment and a day of perdition to ungodly men. The removal of things that are shaken. At the destruction of Jerusalem, it was a day of most awful judgment. The Jewish nation was utterly broken and removed. At this time the legal dispensation was fully destroyed—the finishing stroke was given to it. And then the Gospel dispensation was fully established. It was commenced before but not fully established. All the prophecies for this were fulfilled, and the prediction of Jesus Christ concerning the same events were all fulfilled. Multitudes knew the Savior had foretold the destruction of Jerusalem. And those who before had believed in him, would now have their faith greatly strengthened and confirmed. But it was a day of awful judgment to the ungodly and unbelieving Jews. They "were sifted among all nations, as corn is sifted in a sieve."

And they have been a proverb and a by word among all nations to the present day.

Thus we have taken hold of this text, and explained its meaning, if our friend wishes to build upon it longer, let him do it.

As my time is up, I would simply observe that I have nothing to say in regard to the time my friend wants to occupy to prove his positions, I stand pledged to follow him as long as he wishes to lead. But my friends if you continue to assemble here till my friend proves his point, you will have to assemble all the days of your lives, and be disappointed at last.

*Congregation adjourned.*

---

MONDAY, AUG. 5—9 o'clock, A. M.

---

[MR. POWER'S THIRTEENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Judges and the Audience.*—We come before you on this very pleasant morning to resume our highly responsible labors, of detecting and exposing dangerous errors, and elucidating and exhibiting for your faith and practice, the holy truths of God's revealed word. And we here remark, lest we should omit it subsequently, that we have been much gratified, from the commencement of this discussion, with the orderly, serious and christian deportment of the audience in attendance. Very little feeling of levity has been evinced. Though I cannot say there has been no effort made to excite feelings of this kind. I know the congregation do not sympathise with such things, and we hope the same seriousness will be preserved during the few hours that the discussion may yet continue. I have endeavored to make it a solemn matter, and will continue to do so.

A few remarks now on some items of my friend's last speech.

First, respecting his animadversions on Matth. v, where the Savior instructs his disciples, "if they are persecuted, driven from city to city, brought before civil authorities, scourged and imprisoned, insulted and abused, and called to suffer every thing that a wicked world could inflict upon them, that they were to rejoice and be exceeding glad; for great is their reward in heaven." The gentleman declared, in direct contradiction of this plain declaration of Christ, that heaven means this world, this state of being.

And again: the passage I have cited in another place in this discourse, where the Savior says to the same characters, in reference to the same circumstances—"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal." Here the Redeemer contrasts earth as a place of suffering, and heaven as a place of rewards, as clear as demonstration itself.—And such are the inexplicable difficulties the gentleman's system crowds him into, that he cannot get out of them but by the direct and explicit contradiction of what the Redeemer says. While Jesus says to the persecuted and afflicted christian, who is greatly distressed here, "Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven," the gentleman corrects the Savior, and says, "no, not in heaven, for all your reward is in this earth." The Savior says, in earth is tribulation; all things are passing away; nothing is safe here. Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth, for they will be lost; but lay them up in heaven, for there they will be safe. But Mr. D. says not so, Christ is in error, you cannot lay up your treasure in heaven; you have all your reward in this life; you have all your treasures here on earth.

The next item is Mr. D.'s notice of the book of Job. He made some remarks, tending to excite suspicion in regard to the authenticity of this part of the Scriptures. The system drives its advocates virtually to reject portions of the Bible, and this is one reason why we brought him to

this point—whether the righteous are *fully* rewarded here or not. He maintains that they are. So did the opposers of Job. But Job contended that the wicked are not punished to the full extent in this life; that they often live in great prosperity; while the devoted and pious child of God, so acknowledged by the Almighty himself, under God's mysterious but wise government in this world, is often subject to the greatest calamities. God's word tells us that some of those who had arrived in heaven, *came out of great tribulation.*

Again: I called the attention of my respondent to the decision of God, that He was angry with the friends of Job because they had not spoken the thing that was right, as Job had done. He sanctions Job's position as clearly as language can make it. And having apprised the gentleman, that till he meets this fairly, I would pay but little attention to other points he might raise, he labored some time on the case of Job; and what was the conclusion he came to? It could not have escaped the attention of the congregation. But I will stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance on it. He told you that Job was rewarded—he was blessed at last. But what was Job's reward as a righteous man? Why, in the close of life, he had a wife and children, and sheep and camels, and oxen and asses,—and this was evidence that he was fully rewarded in this world. The conclusion then is, that every man that has a wife and children; and sheep, and oxen, and asses, gives evidence that he is deeply pious and fit for heaven. But some of the most blasphemous and wicked men on earth have all these evidences of piety, and the same reward. How shall we reconcile this? There is a difficulty here. But we will not charge the fault upon the gentleman; it is his system that drives him into such an attitude as this.

He quoted Ps. xcvi and xcvi, in support, as he stated, of his general affirmative. We now inform him that we pass this without reply, until he adduces *all* his proof on his affirmative, and then we will attend to it altogether.—He saw fit to withhold some of his proof when on his affirmative, and now brings it up while on my question, to

have me go back and meet it. This is a singular course—but I do not complain.

He says that the day of general judgment, as taught in the Bible, took place at the destruction of Jerusalem. But here is an insuperable difficulty for him and his system. First, he asserts that the second coming of Christ took place 1800 years ago; that He then accomplished the whole business of His second coming. Then it follows that the general judgment has passed some 1800 years ago.

Again: he staked his whole system on the resurrection of the dead. His arguments on this are still fresh in the minds of all who were present.

But the Bible every where connects the resurrection of the dead, with the last or second coming of Jesus Christ. But Mr. D. says that Christ's second coming and the final judgment passed 1800 years since: then it follows that the resurrection took place 1800 ago: But who possessed of common sense can believe this? I brought this point up in a discussion some time since, with Mr. Kidwell, who stated I was the twenty second minister he had discussed this subject with, and his only reply was, "man does not know every thing that has taken place, and the resurrection might have taken place 1800 years ago, and we know nothing about it."

Now let my friend meet the point, that the coming of Jesus Christ and the resurrection are not future.

We now proceed with our affirmative. You recollect we have now under consideration the second coming of Christ, and the final universal judgment of the world. The fact that the Bible teaches a universal judgment has been conceded by the gentleman. The fact that the Lord Jesus Christ is the judge of the world, has been proved and conceded. Now an important question that concerns us all is, has Jesus Christ come to judge the world? and has this coming been visible and personal to all. We maintain that no such thing has ever taken place in the whole history of the world, and that the event must be future or the Bible false.

We have adduced proof to show that when Jesus Christ

comes in the resurrection, and to judge the world his coming is to be literal, personal, and visible to every individual of our race, as much so as his ascension was to the disciples who were present when he ascended to heaven.

Again: We have shown you that at his coming in the final judgment, the heavens and the earth are to pass away, and be dissolved by fire—a matter that is a subject of observation to every individual on the earth. But no such occurrence has taken place. Therefore, if the Bible testifies truly, it is yet to take place in the future. Mr. D. had something to say about the destruction of this world being figurative. We have only to give him over into the hands of his favorite Dr. Clark, to settle this matter with him.

We adduced proof to show that at this visible coming of Jesus Christ, the dead, good and bad, just and unjust—all the dead of our race shall be raised and the living changed. A circumstance that has never yet transpired. But the Bible has decided that it shall take place; and if it be a true record, and it has not yet taken place, the conclusion is undeniable that it is yet future, and if so, my position is sustained by the high authority of the word of God.

We cite 1 Thes. iv. 13—18. "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive *and* remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: Then we which are alive *and* remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words."

Mark here the living and the dead, are, at the coming

of the Lord; with the shout—with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, which things are connected with the passing away of the visible heavens, and the dissolving of the elements by fire, not to meet at the destruction of Jerusalem, but to be caught up, from this universal change that is taking place in all God's dominions, by the power that said "Let there be light and there was light," to meet the Lord and to be ever with the Lord.

Again: 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52. "Behold I show you a mystery, we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trump shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible and shall be changed." Acts xxiv. 14, 15. "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets: And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Dan. xii. 1, 2. "And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as there never was since there was a nation even to that same time; and at that time they shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Dr. Clark applies this declaration of Daniel to the last general judgment.

Another passage already referred to, John v. 28, 29. "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Rev xx. 12, 13. "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in

them: and they were judged every man according to their works."

Dr. Clarke says this passage has reference specifically to the general universal resurrection, and final judgment and glorification of the pious, and endless perdition of the unbelieving and ungodly. And mark that this solemn scene, one that involves the interest of every member of our race, that includes the resurrection of the body, is by Divine revelation, inseparably connected with the visible coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, with all the holy angels with him, with the literal passing away of the heavens and the earth, with a shout with the voice of the Arch Angel and the trump of God, and raising of all the dead, and the changing of the living upon the earth. Now these things have either all transpired, or they are future, or the Bible records what never has and never will take place. The man that would say they *have* transpired *in the past* would be a fit subject for the mad-house. No individual would assert they have *literally* transpired, and if not, they are necessarily future. God has fixed it in his purpose that they shall be future, and then they must transpire as the word of God can never fail. And just so sure every individual is accountable to God's bar for his moral character here, and just so sure will his destiny be decided for eternity at that bar according to his moral character. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S THIRTEENTH REPLY.]

*Gentlemen Moderators and this Respectable Congregation.*--I feel to congratulate you that we are assembled at this time under such favorable circumstances. In the kind providence of God, it is a glorious morning, and I hope you will cherish the desire, with your humble speaker, that as the natural sun has risen on the earth, dispelling the darkness and gloom of night, so the Son of righteousness may arise on every soul with healing in his beams, and that all darkness and error may be dispelled therefrom.

Our friend Power would have you believe that he has endeavored to maintain a more serious deportment than



myself, during this discussion, and charges me with having taken a course to excite levity in your minds. Now, I say this charge is unfounded altogether; and if any one has been excited to levity by any remarks that I have made, it has been owing to the ludicrous position my friend occupied before the audience, and not to any intention on my part to excite any such feelings. I told you at the outset that we were all mutually interested in knowing the truth, with respect to the points involved in the questions for debate, relative to the final and immortal destiny of our race, and that I had as much interest in coming to the true light on this subject as any one. I told you I wanted you to exercise charity, and divest yourselves of all prejudices, and receive the truth from whatever source it might come, and decide accordingly. I cherish the same feeling still, and I hope now the enquiry with all will be, what is truth? And I hope you will treasure up the truth in your hearts, whether it will result in favor of the position of my friend or of your humble servant.

My friend thinks I did not do away the force of his argument, drawn from the book of Job. But he thought it was not owing to the want of talent on my part, but to the depravity and licentiousness of my system. But whether I failed to remove the force of his argument or not, I leave you to decide for yourselves, and hope you will not let our friend decide for you. But to show you I have not failed here, I will refer to it once more.

You remember my opponent's object was to show that the righteous were not recompensed in this world; that Job was not recompensed for his piety and patience in the present life. You remember I noticed the light in which many divines viewed the book of Job—that there was a difference of opinion about who was the author of the book; when it was written, and whether such a person ever lived, or whether this was an allegory to give important instruction to men, and of God's dealing with them. But our friend has insinuated that the position we took respecting the book of Job, savors of infidelity. He has brought the charge several times against me of holding infidel sentiments, and that our system is identified with infidelity.—

I know his object well, it is to administer prejudice, which on a part of this congregation is very strong.

Now, as to the facts in the case of Job. Was Job, in his latter days, recompensed for all his affliction, or was he not? I adduce the proof to show that he was—let the book speak for itself, Job xlii. 10—17. “And the Lord turned the captivity of Job, when he prayed for his friends: also the Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before. Then came there unto him all his brethren, and all his sisters, and all they that had been of his acquaintance before, and did eat bread with him in his house; and they bemoaned him, and comforted him over all the evil that the Lord had brought upon him: every man also gave him a piece of money, and every one an ear-ring of gold. So the Lord blessed the latter end of Job more than his beginning: for he had fourteen thousand sheep, and six thousand camels, and a thousand yoke of oxen, and a thousand she-asses. He had also seven sons, and three daughters. And he called the name of the first Jemima; and the name of the second, Kezia; and the name of the third, Keren-happuch. And in all the land were no women found so fair as the daughters of Job: and their father gave them inheritance among their brethren.—After this lived Job a hundred and forty years, and saw his sons, and his sons’ sons, even four generations. So Job died, being old and full of days.” He had twice as much as before. Does not this look as if he was recompensed for his afflictions? You recollect that I quoted from Prov. to show that the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner.—Our friend’s position is in opposition to this. And he quoted from Job to show that the righteous are not recompensed in the earth. Now I quote from Job to show that Job was recompensed fully in the earth; and I ask you, my friends, if more signal blessings, or favors of God, could be bestowed upon a man in the earth, than are here described as being bestowed on Job? What more could he have desired than was bestowed upon him? His last days were emphatically his best days. He was blessed abundantly with all the good things of this life. Friends

congratulated him and brought him presents. Here the truth uttered by the wise man was fully verified—"the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth."

Now I do not know but our friend lays such value on his good works, as to lay God under obligations to bestow upon him future immortal life and blessings. Perhaps he does. But I should be contented and satisfied fully, if I could have what good old Job had. I would ask no more of this world--no more of peace and tranquillity. God recompensed Job double in this world, for his trials, and he left the world in peace and went to heaven, as I hope, and there to receive joy and peace for ever more—not as a reward for his good deeds in this life, but all there is bestowed by the grace of God unmerited. Now this is what I bring in opposition to the position of our opponent, showing that God does reward the righteous in this earth.

Our friend pledges himself, he says, to answer my counter testimony when I inform him that I am through. This is a very curious pledge, in order to get rid of examining the testimony, which I bring in opposition to the doctrine of the endless misery of a portion of our race in an immortal state of existence. Now, in my opinion, he does not intend to answer this at all. He will defer it so long that he will say he has not time to attend to it. He does this designedly, for he cannot answer it. He pledged me, yesterday, that, if I would define what I understood by the devil, he would come up and show that those passages which speak of the destruction of the devil and his works, did not mean any such thing. Well, I gave the definition, but he has failed to redeem his pledge. Now, I have proof against his main position, which I shall bring up from time to time. I shall not be able to bring it all up during the discussion, but shall produce as much of it as I can conveniently. And I hope our friend Power will attend to it, or admit that he is unable to remove its force.

Now I come to an important point, a position that has a bearing on the position taken by our friend. He is laboring to confound some two or three events, in order to produce confusion in your minds, and lead you to suppose he is maintaining his position from the Bible. He is con-

founding Christ's coming to judgment upon the Jewish nation, with his coming in the resurrection. These are two distinct events. The Scriptures speak of two different advents of Christ. One in Matth. xxiv, is spoken of. It says—"the Son of man shall come in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." This coming has reference to His coming to inflict judgment on the Jewish nation, according to the predictions of the Prophets, and His own predictions. And this coming to judgment on the Jewish nation to close up the legal dispensation, and fully establish the Gospel dispensation, was to take place during the existence of that generation—during the lifetime of some of Christ's Disciples. In Matth. xvi. 27, 28, Christ fixes this coming of His, during the life time of some of those to whom he was then speaking. Now this coming has already taken place. Christ was to come to execute judgment on the Jews. He was not literally to come in the clouds. Such language is figurative, and employed by the Prophets to denote some great revolutions in nations or governments, either politically or morally, and their final overthrow. As evidence of this, I cite you to similar language in Isaiah, xxxiv. 4. "And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their hosts shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig-tree." This language is not to be understood literally, in reference to the future world. Mark what follows. "For my sword shall be bathed in heaven: behold, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment." Our friend tells you the judgment is all future. But here, it seems, the judgment is coming down to take place in this world.—The result of this judgment is more particularly described in what follows: "The sword of the Lord is filled with blood; it is made fat with fatness, and with the blood of lambs and goats, with the fat of the kidneys of rams: for the lord hath a sacrifice in Bozrah, and a great slaughter in the land of Idumea. And the unicorns shall come down with them, and the bullocks with the bulls; and their land

shall be soaked with blood, and their dust made fat with fatness. For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion.—And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day: the smoke thereof shall go up for ever: from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever. But the cormorant and the bittern shall possess it; the owl also and the raven shall dwell in it: and he shall stretch out upon it the line of confusion, and the stones of emptiness.” Now you see that such highly figurative language was employed by the writers of the Scriptures. All this in Isaiah, you see, has reference to a scene in this world that has actually transpired. So the Savior used similar language in reference to a similar event and that scene actually transpired about eighteen hundred years ago.

But our friend tries to fix this coming of Christ figuratively to judge the Jewish nation (which judgment actually took place) with his coming to raise the dead. He tries to make out that the passage in 2d Peter, Chap. iii. which speaks of the passing away of the heavens and the earth, has reference to the literal heaven and earth. But my friends, I showed you clearly, and illustrated it from my quotations from Heb. xii, that this had reference to the removal of the Jewish economy—the abolishment of the legal dispensation—and should be understood in a figurative sense, and not literally—that it had no reference whatever to the end of the material world.

Now, there is another coming of Christ, entirely distinct from His coming figuratively to judge the Jewish nation. Our friend quotes 1st Thes. iv. which speaks of the raising of the dead. Now this coming, here spoken of, to raise the dead, is entirely distinct from the coming we have described. But for our friend to make out any thing in his favor, he must show that when Christ comes personally to raise the dead and to change the living upon the earth, that this event will result in a judgment and eternal separation of the human family, and the an-

nouncing that a portion of them will be endlessly punished in the future world. If he will do this he will make out his position. But if he fails altogether of doing this, as he has done up to this stage of the discussion, then his position is untenable, and he fails altogether of sustaining the affirmative of the question.

One remark. I was in hopes to have had time to notice again the passages my friend has quoted, with respect to the resurrection. I will do it when I rise again, and show that they fail of proving his position. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S FOURTEENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Judges.*—This is not the first time that we have had our sympathies excited with reference to a theological opponent. I have rarely ever discussed the system I am now opposing without more or less of such feelings. And, I again say, in reference to my worthy friend, that it is not the want of talent on his part, but it is his system, which compels him to appear before this community in the light that he now does. He is again informed that I must pass his remarks till he shall meet my argument drawn from the case of Job.

The question at issue under this head is not whether the righteous and the wicked are finally rewarded and punished or not. We both concede that under God's plan of moral government the righteous will be fully rewarded and the wicked punished according to their deeds. But this is not the issue. He maintains that these rewards and punishments are in their fullest extent absolutely confined to this world. We maintain that, while the righteous are rewarded with a good conscience and all the comforts of religion and the wicked are troubled with a guilty conscience, and sometimes on account of great wickedness are punished with judgments from God, yet these rewards and punishments are not final in this world; but that the final retribution is reserved for the future world. This is the true position in which we stand. And he has tried to reconcile the case of Job to final judgment in this world.

And as evidence of this he said that Job had a wife and children and sheep and oxen and asses, and friends that gave him silver in this world. [Mr. Doolittle here arose and said he wished to correct the gentleman,—that he has not contended that the rewards of the righteous consisted in asses and goats and oxen, but simply that the rewards of the righteous were bestowed upon them in this world.] I would ask if he has adduced any other evidence besides the possession of wife and children and oxen and sheep &c. —Mr. D. "I do not wish for any more evidence."—Well the gentleman has reaffirmed that the possession of a wife and children and friends and their giving him silver, and his having sheep and camels and oxen and asses, is evidence that the righteous are fully and finally rewarded in this world. He says he wants no farther evidence than this.

But we refer you to higher authority on this than our friend. And would ask him too, if Christ whose teaching is infallible, when he says "lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven" does not contrast them with those treasures of earth, such as oxen and sheep &c.? The apostle says 1 Pet. i. 3, 4. "Blessed be the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away reserved in heaven for you." Here the Holy spirit speaking by the apostle has fixed the time of receiving the incorruptible inheritance, the final reward, to the last day, or to the future world "in heaven." But the gentleman will make the Savior say, "Lay up for yourselves treasures, that is, sheep and oxen and silver in heaven." To say nothing of its infidelity and licentiousness, what a system it must be that could place such a man as my worthy friend, a man of his talents, in such a ludicrous position before this intelligent community!

But his position, with all the tenacity with which he contends for it, is much more ludicrous if possible, when viewed from other points. What would you think of the laws of Ohio if the seducer could come and destroy the vir-

true and peace of your domestic circle, the murderer take the lives of your children, the robber take your purse, and if you complained at all, the infamous assassin could cut your throat, and the laws of the state should take up all the felons that had thus ruined you, and not only arrest, but try, condemn, sentence, and inflict on them the full penalty of the law for their crime and yet they neither knew nor believed that they had been arrested or suffered any punishment whatever?—what would you think of such laws as these? Why, you would say that such a code of laws, should be the detestation of every intelligent being in the universe. But, the gentleman's position involves much greater folly and infamy than this.

What does his system maintain? Why that the infamous seducer and corrupt adulterer in the very act of crime, blighting the peace and happiness of soul and body here, and according to the word of God, in the endless future, and the robber that takes your purse, and the bloodthirsty assassin that cuts your throat, are all of them under the moral government of God,—at the very time too of their committing their acts—being judged, condemned and punished to the full extent of their crimes—while they neither feel or know that they suffer any punishment whatever, and will assert that they are not punished at all, and feel nothing to deter them from going into such crimes again and continuing in them through life. And yet Mr. D's. system says to each one, you are now suffering the full penalty for your crimes, and if you should now die in the act of crime, the full penalty of the crime is felt, and you are sure of heaven as soon as you leave the world. If you die a liar or adulterer or murderer, God will in some way effect a change in your character, and you are just as sure of heaven as if you were now there. Is this mere speculation? Look about on sinners. Do they believe they have been fully punished, or are now being fully punished for their sins? No, they do not believe it in life or in death. Now look at the gentleman's position. He has said during this discussion, "that all sinners are punished as a *matter of fact, though they may not believe it.*" Then what has a man to do to avoid the Universalist Hell?



Nothing but to become an orthodox sinner, and—if the doctrine of Universalism is true—reject their doctrine and then he is free from all punishment in this world or in the future world.

I ask again, would a gentleman of our friend's learning and sense,—and you see he is something of a philosopher into the bargain,—would he place himself in such a position before this community, if it were not for the utter falsity and licentiousness of his system? Do not think that it is the want of talents in our friend, or skill in discussion; for I have a document that says he is fully able and competent to discuss this question.

Our mutual friend Esq. Tenney, recommended him to me as one able to discuss the whole subject, and that his friends were willing to trust the matter in his hands. And I will say that he is the ninth gentleman with whom I have discussed this subject and he is fully at par or a little above any of them, and yet the depravity of his system has placed him in this unenviable attitude before you.

Let us look at this from another point. Take the abominable business of gambling. This is a species of the Universalist hell. The moment a man goes to the card-table he goes into hell, and the smoke of his torment goes up, frequently, from sundown till morning light, and he is in the agonies of hell. How intolerable it is! But he has the key to come out in the morning. But after he escapes he is not as cautious as was the goat. Some men enticed a goat into a tavern and got him drunk, and he amused them much with his pranks. But after he became sober no inducement could ever get the goat into the tavern again. Not so with him who has been in this hell. He is almost ready to chide the sun in the heavens for his tardiness in delaying the night, so that he can turn his key and go again into hell. He loves to live there. And I expect, if, in some of those places, my friend were to conceal their key, they would drum him out of town. They would not like to be deprived of the privilege of going to hell. The gentleman need not fear that I will plead want of time to meet his counter proof which he may bring.

One remark more in this place. I wish it understood

in this community—not however in the character of complaint—that I have not been discussing the subject, with my friend Mr. Doolittle alone for he has had a council of war all the time. And I am meeting the whole strength of the Universalist ministers of this region. And I am glad to do it, and do not blame my friend for availing himself of the help. I wish he had a score more to assist him.

My friend said he had explained his position with regard to the devil and I had avoided it. You will recollect his position on this point. He said the devil did not imply an intelligent being or agent abstract and separate from man. This was his negative position. His positive definition was, the devil as taught in the Bible is the spirit or principle of evil personified. I then asked him if every man that is tempted of the devil had this principle of evil in him; and he answered in the affirmative. We then required him to reconcile this evil principle with the temptation of the Savior on the mount,—Jesus Christ being holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sin. And when he would tell us how this evil principle cast out of man went into the swine, and caused them to rush into the lake and drown; then we would meet him on this point, but till then we should consider him fully refuted on this head.

But lest he should think we slight him, we will say, that no one will deny that Jesus Christ was tempted by the devil. But the devil according to Mr. D. is an evil principle inseparable from human nature. Then it follows that Jesus Christ had this principle, this devil in his nature. Jesus Christ with all the purity of his nature, was as much possessed with the devil as those out of whom he cast the devils! This is blasphemy, and rejects Jesus Christ as the Holy one! I hope our friend will try to get out of this position, if he cannot alone, let him call these ministers to his help, and then if all of them cannot, I hope a coroner's inquest will be held over this defunct system. I have showed that the gentleman's position is blasphemous, for holding that Jesus Christ was *possessed with a devil*. But if he says that Jesus Christ did not possess this devil, then he has to take this principle personified,

and give it a body, such as he has described in another place, or give it some other shape to suit himself, so that he can get it in some way into the mountain, to tempt the Savior. And furthermore, he has to assume that this principle which has only a *relative* existence, is created into an abstract, separate principle, and is cast out of a man and enters into a herd of swine, and caused them in their phrenzy to rush into the waters and perish. Now, we think the gentleman will not complain that we have passed over this point.

We now proceed with the arguments. It has been shown that Jesus Christ is to come literally and visibly, in the glory of his Father with the holy angels to judge the world. That this is connected with the passing away of the visible heavens and earth, and with the dissolving of the elements by fire. And that this coming is connected with the resurrection of the dead.

I now proceed to show that the whole race of mankind will be personally assembled at the bar of God, when Christ comes to judge the world. Matth. xxv. 32. "And before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats." Acts xvii. 31. "Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead." 2d Peter ii. 4. "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment." Jude 6. "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." [*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S FOURTEENTH REPLY.]

*My Friends.*—I hope that our honorable opponent here will endeavor to keep cool a little longer. I do not wonder, however, that he is agitated at this stage of the discussion. He is aware of the heavy responsibilities rest-

ing upon him, and that he is far behind in argument and proof to sustain his position. He has assailed our system, I had almost said, for the hundredth time, accusing it of Infidelity and licentiousness, and of every thing that is bad. I have always observed that when an opponent resorted to such a course it was because he had no better arguments. But the question is not what is the character of our system, but what do the Scriptures teach concerning the immortal destiny of man? My friend is to prove, if he can, that a portion of our race will suffer endless punishment in a state of immortality. And I want you, my friends, to mark well the nature of the proof he adduces to sustain this position. I have felt calm during this whole discussion, not a doubt has flitted across my mind as to where the proof from the Bible would rest before this community. And now I say, at this time, what I ventured to predict yesterday, that our friend, notwithstanding he possesses as much ability as any man on his part that could be brought into the field, has utterly failed thus far to sustain his position, and will continue to fail till the close. Now I refer to what he says is our relative position at this point. He says that I maintain that the final consummation of all rewards and punishments will take place in this world. Whereas, he maintains the position that the rewards of the righteous will be fully consummated in the eternal state—that there they will be forever happy, and that then the punishment of the wicked will be fully visited upon them, and they will suffer in endless perdition.

And now I ask again, for the fifth or sixth time, what proof he has brought to show that any will be punished endlessly in an immortal state of existence? He has labored with a good deal of ability and ingenuity, to prove that there is to be a final future judgment for all men, and that at that judgment, eternal life will be awarded to some, and everlasting misery to others. On the other hand, for the purpose of putting a veto on this position, altogether I have clearly and demonstratively shown from the Scriptures, in harmony with reason, and with the great volume of nature every where spread out before us, and with the

history of our race, that this is not the fact; but that the present world is the place of retribution; that God metes out to man in this life, rewards and punishments, in exact proportion to merit and demerit.

For the benefit of many who were not here yesterday, I will repeat. I said there is a God, the judge of all the earth, who judgeth in the earth, and that the day that God had appointed in which He would judge the world in righteousness, by Jesus Christ, was the Gospel day, including the whole Mediatorial reign of Christ. And in confirmation of this fact I quoted our Savior's declaration—"Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the prince of this world be judged." He did not say the judgment of this world would be in the future state, but "now is the judgment of this world, and for judgment I am come into this world." Again: I quoted the declaration of the wise man. "I saw under the sun the place of judgment."—Under the sun, mark. And why was judgment under the sun? Because "wickedness was there, and in the place of righteousness; that iniquity was there." Again: I said that all this was in harmony with other declarations of holy writ.

The prophet said, speaking of Christ, "He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he hath set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law." And the results of this judgment, we said, would all be glorious, and we should all rejoice in view of them. Whereas, the position taken by my friend is, that we shall mourn and lament at the results of the judgment. For he says it will result in the endless perdition and misery of a great portion of the human family. But no such results are spoken of in connection with the judgment, which the Bible teaches, takes place. In view of the judgment in this world, the Bible speaks of the joy and peace attending the way of the righteous, while it says the way of the transgressor is hard, and there is no peace to the wicked. But such will be the results of the judgment here that we are all called upon to rejoice on account of it. In proof of this, I quoted *Psa. xcvi. 10—13*. "Say among the heathen, that the Lord reigneth: the world also shall be established that it shall not be

moved: he shall judge the people righteously. Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fullness thereof. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein: then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord: for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth: he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth." And the same, nearly, is repeated again in the 98th Psalm, and here all are called upon to rejoice because the Lord is coming to judge the world in righteousness, and the Psalmist does not tell us that this judgment is to be in the future world, as our friend affirms. And there is a good reason why he does not tell us it will be in the future world, for it has nothing to do with the future world; for where a man sows, there shall he reap. "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption, but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting." Mark, a man reaps where he sows his grain. "And this," says the Savior, "is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. He that believeth on me *hath* everlasting life." Those who sow to the spirit do now, where they sow, reap this life everlasting. "He that soweth to the flesh shall reap corruption." But shall he reap corruption in the future world? in an immortal state, where all are raised incorruptible, and are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection, and not subject to death any more? How can he reap corruption there? Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of immortality. It is impossible. So you see that our friend has altogether failed to sustain even the preliminary part of his argument—that there is a judgment in the future world. I admitted the universality of the judgment, and proved it, and where it was. I proved that all shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ, and that every one shall receive, in the body—not out of the body—his reward according to his deeds.

Our friend has quoted many texts, and we have noticed them all, and will notice all he will bring, but in all, not a single word is said about a judgment beyond

the present world. It is as clear as the shining of the sun in the heavens this cloudless morning, that not a single text he has brought has any reference to an immortal state of existence.

I come now to notice some other strange things that our friend has said. He represents me as holding to some ridiculous and false positions. And you noticed he told us he had been informed that Mr. Doolittle was a man of some talent, sense, and philosophy—that his friends had confidence in him, as competent to debate the points at issue—and that he was the ninth man he had discussed with, and he thought he was fully at par, or a little more, with any man he had ever debated with, and yet, he represented that this same able gentleman maintained the foolish position that the wicked were fully punished for their sins in this world, and yet they know nothing about it. Now this is a very erroneous idea.

[Mr. Power here made a correction, saying: "I asserted that the gentleman maintained that sinners are punished in this world in exact proportion to the multitude and magnitude of their sins, and I then maintained that if this were true, thousands of persons died, not knowing it—but in life and in death they deny having been punished according to the multitude and magnitude of their sins."]

Well, our friend Power says it is his *assertion*, and I hope you will take it for what it is worth for *assertion* is not *proof*, if it were, he would make out his position very clearly. My assertion is just as much proof as his, but I do not want you to rely on his or my assertion, but on the scriptures.

But as to the assertion, it is very curious that sinners should be punished here on earth, and yet know nothing about it. I want to know if David, the adulterer and murderer, knew nothing about being punished for his sins when he said "the pains of hell gat hold on me, and the sorrows of death encompassed me." And when he thanked God for delivering him from the lowest hell, into which he had fallen in this world for his sins? And when God meted out the punishment of Cain in this world, for his

ans, did he know nothing about it. When he exclaimed, "my punishment is greater than I can bear," did he not know that he was punished for his sins in this world?

Did the Antediluvians know nothing about their punishment, when they were all destroyed from the face of the earth, on account of their great corruption? Did not the Sodomites, after they had been repeatedly warned by righteous Lot, and still persevered in their iniquity, know that they were punished for their sins when the Lord rained fire and brimstone upon them, and they were all destroyed, and their city sunk? We will now let the gentleman's assertion on this go for what it is worth.

As to the charge of licentiousness and infidelity, I say no more about it, only that this is the course pursued by errorists, and has been in all ages of the church, against those who hold to the truth. The Roman Catholics charged the Protestants with heresy, for which they doomed them to be roasted alive. But what does this amount to? Of what advantage here is it to raise the cry of mad dog! mad dog! or endeavor to make our system a devouring beast, with head and horns? We know well the object of the gentleman; it is to excite your prejudice against our views, and keep you from looking candidly at our arguments. But we trust that you have too much sense to be swayed by such false charges as these.

The gentleman says he is not contending with me alone, but with all the Universalist ministers in this region.— Why I told you before, that my friends had gathered around me here, as his friends had around him; but not for the purpose of assistance. I have never requested any of my brethren to assist me. The gentleman has accused me, not only of getting help here, but of calling to my aid Dr. Clarke. I suppose he would have you believe that he relies entirely on his own ability, to carry on this discussion. But this is not altogether the case. If I am not mistaken, he has a certain book lying before him, entitled, "Power on Universalism," and he follows up the author very closely. So I would have you know that I am not contending with my friend Power alone, but with the Rev. John H. Power on Universalism. How strictly he has



conformed to the letter and spirit of that work, as all who are familiar with the work well know.

But my friend wants me to give him some more light about the devil.

Now I have given him all the light he requested me to give in the outset, as a condition of his examining my texts. He said when I would give my definition of what the devil was, he would take hold of my proof texts and examine them. Well, I told him that I did not believe that the devil was a created personal being, or any thing separate from the spirit of evil in man; that I did not believe he was a creature with a body as large as twice ten thousand mammoths, with eyes like two blazing comets, and a tail that would draw a third part of the stars of heaven after it; and that he roamed over the earth, unseen, seeking to catch and drag men and women down to hell. Now, for the gentleman to redeem his pledge, he must come up here and meet my proof texts; and, as I told you, he can do nothing without the use of the devil. For if the sheriff is destroyed, will not the prisoners escape? I have proved the destruction of the devil and of his works, and now I want the gentleman to take hold of this point.

I shall not inform our friend when I shall get through with the proof in support of my position. I have given him some proof which put a veto on his position entirely. This he has not upset, and he is getting behind hand, and will be lost for ever if he does not come up soon to the work.

Now I will adduce another proof on my argument, Matth. xxii. 37—40. "Jesus said unto him, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Here the law of God is laid down, and this law of love is *made obligatory on every individual of our race; it is a universal law*. And our Savior has told us "Till heaven and earth pass one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Hence, this proves conclusively that all

moral beings will be brought to love God with all their hearts, and their neighbor as themselves. And "love is the fulfilling of the law." Now this proof, with kindred others from the Bible, proves conclusively that *all* will love God; consequently be holy and happy.

[Time expired.]

[MR. POWER'S FIFTEENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Judges and this attentive Congregation.*—Our Universalist friends on other occasions have given intimations that it was perilous to hear the conclusion of a debate of this kind, but I hope our friends here are not of this character, and that they will stay and hear the conclusion, as we hope to close this evening.

A remark on the gentleman's observations about a certain book. He thought I had made it a matter of complaint that he had obtained aid from commentaries and other sources. I by no means intended to complain, but said that I had come to this discussion relying for support on the Scriptures, not intending to use commentaries and authors. And I would not have departed from this course but to save the respected dead from misrepresentation and as an offset to the gentleman's position. But he adduced a certain author and said I adhered to him very closely. Well this is rather a delicate matter, but lest the audience should not be informed, I would say that Power the author of that book is Mr. Doolittle's present opponent. And further that since that book was written, I have not but in a very few instances referred to it in debate, and then only as a matter of historical reference, as the doctrines of several standard Universalist authors are recorded in that work.

His remark on my pledge to notice his texts &c., on the devil contains a mistake. I said whenever he would define his position with reference to the devil, I would show that his interpretation was false and afforded no support to his system. Well he defined his position as he said, and we have shown that it makes Jesus Christ a depraved and corrupt being, and it makes a relative prin-

ciple, an abstract individual principle. Now an interpretation that involves such consequences and absurdities must be false. But his interpretation does this; and therefore is an utter perversion of the word of God. We think we have now redeemed the pledge. [Mr. Doolittle here remarked that the gentleman did not come right to the point yet, that his pledge was to examine the texts he quoted in Heb. and 1 John, and shew that they did not prove the destruction of the devil and his works, and that the pledge was not redeemed.] Very well, I still claim that the gentleman either willfully or from his confusion on the point misunderstands me. But lest he should think we fear to notice the texts we make an additional remark. Mr. D's supposed support lies in assuming that in the language of the Bible, destruction, necessarily means annihilation, or taking the things destroyed to heaven. This we deny. And till he proves it, all he may say on the subject will avail him nothing. The devil shall be destroyed,—so brought under Christ's power and so subdued and confined that he will be utterly unable to make any resistance or any more disturb the peace of the church, or pass his limits.

The gentleman asserted that he has noticed all my texts. He has not met one of the numerous texts that I have adduced on my affirmative; but merely said they did not touch the point and so passed them. He used the text, "he that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting."

Now the results of sowing to the flesh or Spirit are either absolutely confined to this world or to the future world, or they commence here and extend into the future world. If he admits that the results extend into the future world he yields the whole ground. But if to avoid this he confines the "corruption" resulting from sowing to the flesh to this world, and confines the "life everlasting" resulting from sowing to the Spirit absolutely to this world, then it indispensably follows that the saint that sows to the Spirit, if he go into heaven at all, will be there without everlasting life. "He that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap

life everlasting" or eternal life. But he says this is confined exclusively to this world and cannot extend into the future world. And consequently if the individual who has sown to the Spirit goes into the future world, it is without eternal life, and if he goes there without this life, he will eternally remain without it.

A word in relation to the sixth edition of the gentleman's formal and philosophical argument to show that the final general judgment takes place in this world.

We have explained our views on this subject with sufficient clearness, and will only add, that it is said that Samuel, Jephthah, Sampson and others judged Israel so many years each. What do we understand by their judging Israel? Why, only that they administered the government at that time. And in this sense God judges the earth. He administers the government that he has adopted, and well adapted to man in this world. But this by no means supercedes the final judgment of God, at the consummation of all things when every individual of our race will be called before His bar, and the final sentence passed upon each according to their moral character in this world, when the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment and the righteous into life eternal. He is exceedingly unfortunate in the cases referred to in proof of his position. For example, the antediluvians, and Sodomites, they, according to Mr. D. were finally judged, and fully punished for their sins in this world. What are the facts in the case? Why, after a life of unparalleled wickedness they were, by a sudden death of a few moments, or at most a few hours suffering, taken to heaven; while Noah, and Lot, as a final reward for their righteousness were denied that privilege, and doomed to many years toil and suffering in this world! So you see my friend not only fails to sustain his point, but clearly proves our charge, that his system offers a *reward for wickedness*. If Lot and Noah had been as corrupt as their neighbors they would have gone to heaven with them. But alas! their piety shut them out from heaven for many long years of trial and sufferings!!

I am surprised that he should quote the command that

we should love God with all our heart and our neighbor as ourself, to prove Universalism. This is like some other of his random shots, in adducing his proof. And when he shall have brought forward all his proof on his affirmative, then we stand pledged to dispose of it and show that so far from sustaining his positions it contradicts all of them.

With regard to the licentiousness of his system, and the effort on my part as he says to gain some revenue by exciting the prejudices of the congregation against it. If I cannot have a more sure source of revenue than this I will change my business. I do not wish a revenue that depends on the *prejudices* of the people. Our cause appeals for support to enlightened common sense and to the word of God. But there is another view of this subject. The gentleman desires to forestall the truth in the case by raising a "revenue" in another corner. We told you in the outset that the system we oppose is at eternal issue with the word of God, and that one feature of it is to claim common ground with the christian denominations in the land, in order to conceal its real character, and it dreads to have its covering taken off.

We brought the charge of infidelity against the system understandingly, and in winding up the business will sustain it by proof that no Universalist will question for a moment, unless he will abandon Mr. Doolittle altogether; for he shall be my witness in this case. I will prove my premises by him and then every one can easily draw the conclusion.

The gentleman need not fear that we will slight him in his proof. We stand pledged to pay attention to it in time. He has not met in detail one of the texts quoted in my last three speeches although he asserted that he had not passed by one of them. He cited Matth. xvi, 27, 28. "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." To have this avail him he must have this last clause read, "till they see the Son

of man coming in the *glory of his father with his angels*" but unfortunately for him it reads very differently. It is a mere assumption to make Christ's declarations in both these verses refer to the same event. There are two prominent, all important, and interesting events contemplated in this address. And they are clearly defined. First the Son of man will come in the glory of his Father with his angels and then he shall reward every man according to his works. This is a universal proposition and includes every one of our race. This coming is yet future. At this coming Christ will appear to all in the glory of his Father with the holy angels with him, the earth shall be burned up and the dead shall be raised, and every person shall stand at the bar of God in his own personal character. But another thing is referred to, which would be an evidence when it took place that Christ would come to the final judgment in the manner he had described. Some should not taste death till they saw the Son of man coming in his *kingdom*. But the kingdom of God cometh not with literal observation, but in the manifestation of the power of God by his Spirit, convicting the sinner and leading him to forsake his wicked ways and turn to the Lord, and filling his people with the Holy Spirit as on the day of Pentecost. It will be plain, to every one who carefully examines this passage, that Christ speaks of two events. One is his coming with the angels to judge the world. He says in another place "this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." But what does "*generation*" mean in the language of the Bible? It is used to represent moral character, "this wicked generation," "Generation of the righteous," &c. Christ used it to denote moral character. Then "this generation," the righteous should not pass away till all be fulfilled.

But when Christ speaks of coming in his kingdom alone without the angels, he says—"there be some standing here that shall not taste of death," till they witness this event. This was his coming on the day of Pentecost, coming in his spiritual kingdom.

I was quoting proof when last on the floor to show that all mankind, good and bad, men and angels, in connection with

the coming of Jesus Christ, at the resurrection of the dead, and the burning up of the world, should be assembled at the bar of God. We now give a few more quotations on the same subject. Eccl. xii, 14. "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." Matt. xii, 36, 37. "But I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned."

We now cite some passages that have reference to the final decision at the bar of God, fixing the eternal destiny of each one according to his moral character. Matt. xxv. chapt. 34, 41, and 46, verses. "Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, come, ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." It will be seen from the connection here, that all nations are included, the good and the bad. The strongest language is used to denote universality. And here the final decision is made. "And these [the wicked] shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." This decision is unalterable. The eternal destiny is now sealed. Again, 2 Thess. chapt. i. 7—10 verses. "And to you, who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day." Rev. xx, 13—15, "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were

cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Rev. chapt. xxi, verse 8. "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers; and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." And Jude 7th verse. "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of the eternal fire."

We will just remark, that in the application of these passages of scripture we have the authority of the gentleman's able critic Dr. Adam Clarke.

We have shown that the wicked will be separated from the righteous at the final judgment, and will adduce further proof that they will be endlessly separated and punished. Now will the gentleman inform me when he has finished bringing forward all his proof? [*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S FIFTEENTH REPLY.]

I presume the majority of those who were present at the outset of the discussion, recollect that our friend claimed that a certain postscript gave him liberty to enter the whole field of Universalism for full and free discussion; and that he pledged himself to this intelligent congregation to stay here till he had buried the system of Universalism and performed its funeral honors; and I feel somewhat inclined to hold him to his pledge. I have heard nothing of his intention to redeem the pledge for two days past, but I hope he has not forgotten it. I should judge, from the position he occupies, this is getting to be an uphill business, and that we shall not have the grave dug, and the funeral rites attended to; especially, if he intends to have the debate closed to-day.

With these remarks, I now will notice some of the gentleman's statements in his last speech.

He says my definition of the devil, makes Jesus Christ



a depraved, corrupt being. What was my definition? I said I did not believe the devil was a separate, created being. This, he says, will make Christ a depraved being. But this does not follow. The texts I quoted shows that Christ will destroy the devil and his works—that he was manifested for this purpose. The devil inherits flesh and blood—belongs to all the children of men—is inherent in their earthly constitution. Now, Christ takes upon himself this same human nature, that he might destroy the devil and his works. Says the Apostle, “We have not an high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.” Now you see, being tempted of the devil does not suppose sin in the individual tempted. Christ was tempted in all respects as we are, because he took upon him human nature, and was incident to all the temptations arising from this nature; but he did not yield to the temptation, consequently, he was without sin.—Now I hope my friend will not any longer contend that my definition makes Christ a depraved being.

The next remark of the gentleman was, that when the Bible speaks of destroying the devil, we are not to suppose it means taking him to heaven. Very true. And we have not contended for any such thing. I do not believe the Bible teaches any such thing, of course; for I do not believe in a created personal devil, and hence the idea of taking him to heaven is out of the question. When our friend will prove that he is a created being, then it will be time to talk about the damnation or salvation of the devil. But the question is not whether the devil is a creature with head and horns, and all the other appendages necessary, or whether he be a mere personification of evil—but will the devil and his works be destroyed? Or will they exist to all eternity? I adduced proof to show that the devil, whatever might be his nature, shall be destroyed with all his works, and consequently that no one could be troubled by him more, and find him in the way of their final redemption. Now why does not our friend come up like a soldier of the cross, well equipped for war, and take hold of these passages, and show, if he can, that

not prove the destruction of the devil and his

n: the gentleman tells us that Samuel and several judged Israel. Well, this is all true. But what has this on the question whether the judgment of in this world, or in the eternal world? I could his object in citing these cases. There is no parallel or comparison to be instituted between the judgment administered by man, and the judgment of God in this world. Would he have us believe that the judgment of God is as fallible as that of mortal man? Perhaps can give us more light on this.

n: my friend says when he cannot make revenue without making epithets and charges upon our system, he abandons his business. Well, I thought he began to be tired of charging infidelity and licentiousness upon them, without sustaining any of them. [Mr. Power stated that he was misrepresented.] I think he has made his assertion, verbatim; and I call for an explanation.

I am not right here. [Mr. Power explained—"I said, if I could not support my system without raising it on the sympathies and prejudices of the people, I would abandon my business, and not endeavor to support it in reference to the system, I intended to prove all that, by Mr. Doolittle himself."] Well, this is but a variation from what I have said. I have repelled the charges; and in reference to one important charge, which was pronounced slanderous and false, I have given him over to the hands of our friend Loring, who will in due season do justice to the matter.

The next statement I notice in order, is: he says he has some ten or fifteen texts as proof of a judgment in the world, which I have not noticed. Now I deny the correctness of this statement. I stand pledged to notice every proof text that has any bearing on the subject. I have noticed every text that he has quoted to prove judgment in a future world, except some in the last chapter, which I have not had time to notice. I have put them all in the balance, and proved that this universal judgment on the part of God, was to transpire in

this world, and that there was no proof of its being in a future world; and in due time I shall sum up this proof.

The next thing I notice, is my friend's curious comment on Matth. xvi. 27, 28, which reminded me that the sign for all kinds of twisting and turning was over his door for a certainty. He tried to do away the force of clear and positive testimony which fixes the time of the judgment.

If I loose sight of the position taken by my friend, in explaining this away, I hope he will correct me. I wish to have you bear in mind what is asserted in this text.—1st. He asserts, "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels." 2d. He tells us what he will do when he comes in this manner—"and then he shall reward every man according to his works." 3d. He tells us, when this shall take place, "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Now precisely the same event is referred to in Matth. xxiv. 29, 30. "Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Now in reference to this event, the Savior adds, "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled." But our friend Power tells us that the *generation* here has reference to moral character, and not to a class of individuals, or generation of men. He says it refers to the righteous. That *he* is wrong here I will now prove. The Savior has reference here to his coming to punish the Jews—to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. Hence, in referring to the same event, in Matth. xxiii. 35, 36, he says, "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel, unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily, I say unto you, All these things shall come upon

this generation,"—and then expresses in most pathetic language his grief that Jerusalem is to be thus desolated. In both or all of these cases, you see he is speaking of the same event, for he says, "this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." Now, my friends, I want you to judge who is in the right, in regard to the time of this coming, the nature of the judgment, and what is meant by the term *generation*. I want you to judge rightly of the reasonableness and consistency of our friend's interpretation, in order to do away with the force of the text.

Again: I notice Eccl. xii. 14. "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." We have no issue here—we believe that every work will be brought into judgment.

Again: Matth. xii. 36. "But I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment." We are not at issue here either. And mark, this does not prove that the judgment is in the future world, and that it will result in the endless perdition of a great portion of our race.

Now we come to what our friend considers the great desideratum, the winding up of the whole thing. He tells you, "now we are coming to the conclusion of the matter, the immortal destiny of the human race." Now I intend to notice this text most thoroughly, as I will every other text he will adduce, that has a bearing on this great subject. I want this congregation to be the witnesses whether I examine it closely or not. My friend quoted Matth. xxv. 34, 41, 43. The last verse contains the substance of the whole point at issue. "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal. Now, my friends, we take the position that this text has no reference to the condition of man in the immortal state of existence. Our friend says it has. Which is right? If he is right, I am wrong; if I am right, he is wrong, for we are directly opposite. Now for the testimony. This xxvth and the xxivth chapter of Matth. are a continued and connected conversation, commencing in the xxiii chapter, and referring to the same period of

time for their fulfillment, embracing circumstances and events which were all to transpire during the existence of the generation of men then living on the earth. In the last part of the xxiii chapter, and in the xxiv, Christ speaks of the civil polity of the Jews, the close of the legal dispensation, and the destruction of Jerusalem, and the scattering of the Jews through all the nations of the earth. The opening of the 25th chapter commences with the adverb *then*. After the Savior gets through with a statement of the events that were to transpire—the destruction of Jerusalem, &c., he changes the conversation, and gives a statement of the situation, or condition, of his kingdom *when* those events should take place. “Then shall the kingdom of heaven,” &c. By the kingdom of heaven here, we understand the Gospel kingdom, which Jesus Christ had set up according to the prophecy of Daniel, and which, as we design to show, has no reference to the condition of man in an immortal state of existence.

[*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S SIXTEENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Judges and the Congregation.*—We have but a few remarks to make on Mr. D's last speech, before calling your attention to the all-important subject of man's future changeless and eternal destiny.

First, in reference to my pledge to perform the funeral services of Universalism before I leave this village. I will correct the mistake into which he has fallen, by giving you the facts in the case. I charged Universalism with maintaining certain positions, and then in strong but respectful language challenged Mr. D. or any of his friends to deny it. Mr. Loring said he would accept it. And at a subsequent time he arose and said, if he did not prove the charge false, he would abandon the corrupt system, and would dig its grave. And I replied that I would stay and preach its funeral.

One remark more. It has not escaped the observation of this respected congregation, that there has been an effort made this afternoon, to get up a kind of an excitement to throw us off from the point in debate.

[An allusion is made here to some remarks that were made before commencing the debate this afternoon. Some things transpired on several occasions and remarks were made which created a little confusion at the time, which have not been noticed in this report.]

But this is not alarming to me at all. Such things are common among the advocates of Universalism. There is but one other movement to be tried and then their skill will be exhausted, i. e. after the discussion is closed they will most likely say there have been so many converts made during the discussion. The remedy for this is, for our friends here to require the reading of their names.

A word on his remarks with reference to the devil, and the character of Jesus Christ. He stated that there is no devil separate and apart from the constitution of human nature. That Jesus Christ took upon himself human nature, and that his purity consisted in not yielding to the temptation of the devil, or his depraved human nature. Confirming my statement that his system makes Christ a depraved being. But he says Christ did not yield to this corrupt nature and this was his virtue.

His remarks on Matth. xvi, 27, 28. We remind you again that any interpretation of the word of God that contradicts matter of facts is false and should be rejected. We maintained that the 27th verse announces things that have never taken place. And to interpret this so as to have it apply to any thing past is to contradict matter of fact. Has Jesus Christ ever come in the glory of his Father with his angels and rewarded every man according to his works? Never. Consequently it is yet future. The next verse says that some who heard him, should not taste death till they saw him coming in his kingdom. But he does not say to reward every man according to his works. He was coming in his spiritual kingdom. This was in perfect accordance with matter of fact. And any other interpretation would contradict stubborn facts. It is no where said, that Jesus Christ would come in the glory of his Father with his angels to reward every man according to his works, during the life-time of any to whom he was speaking.

We affirm again, that the term *generation* is used in the Scriptures to denote moral character. "Ye generations of vipers" referring to their wicked moral character. This generation extends through the whole history of man. It is sometimes used to denote a whole race of men, as the descendants of Abraham, and so of other nations. The history of the Jews for the last 1800 years gives evidence that they will not pass away till all this is brought to pass, though they will be converted to Christ. Then this coming of Jesus Christ is to be literal. It is not limited to the lifetime of any individual, but is characterized by the term *generation* which means moral character or a race which will exist to the end of time, when Christ shall appear in the manner described.

Now we resume the argument. We have shown you the absurdity connected with a progressive final judgment and retribution in this world. We have shown that the judgment involves circumstances and takes into account scenes that have never transpired in the history of our race, and if the Bible is a true record, they must take place yet in the future. We have shown also that Christs coming to judge the world is to be as literal and visible as his ascension into heaven, and this is to take place before the eyes of the whole world. And also when this takes place the visible heavens shall pass away and the earth be dissolved with fire, the dead shall be raised, and the living changed, and the whole race of intelligent beings, good and bad are to appear before the visible literal throne of the infinite Judge, there to be judged and receive their final doom for eternity according to their deeds in this world.

For a more detailed account of this scene we refer you to Matth. xxv. commencing at the 31st verse. Indulge us while we say to this dying congregation, that we are all deeply and equally concerned in this subject. Whatever may be your personal feelings or views, this subject involves your happiness not only in this brief state of existence but to all eternity. You may cast a veil over the truth now, but the future will reveal the fact and you will see the result of your decision on this question. Now read this description in Matthew, and see if the world has ever

witnessed these scenes. The gentleman referred to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman army, for the fulfillment of this scene. Were the Roman soldiers the holy angels that were to come with Jesus Christ? All nations shall be gathered before him. This includes every nation that ever has existed or ever will exist. The word *all* here cannot be restricted. The infinite God has not restricted it; and the circumstances of the case cannot restrict it. "And he shall separate them one from another," not as nations but as individuals, setting the good on his right hand and the bad on his left hand. He goes on to specify a whole catalogue of christian duties, and to notice the moral state of the heart of men and women *individually*. Many of them are benevolent and charitable, and others are just the opposite or are hypocritical. All these states of heart are noticed in the final account and all are rewarded accordingly. No one ever thought, and the Bible never recognizes such a thing, as asking a *nation* if it visited any one in prison or administered to the wants of the sick, or did any such thing. It would be absurd to think of such a thing. These things belong to *individuals* and not to *nations*. Then, the things described here involve the interests of every individual of our race, and each one of us will be personally and eternally involved in the decision made at the judgment here described. The line of distinction between the good and the bad will be brought to bear on each one of us. Our final destiny will be fixed according to our moral character here. If we are found on the side of the impenitent, the bad, we shall go away into everlasting punishment. But if we are so happy as to have made our peace with God here, and are included among the righteous, we shall go into life eternal. And life eternal you will mark, is the highest blessing that can be bestowed upon man or that is promised in the Bible. And another thing you observe that the punishment threatened to the wicked will endure just as long as the blessings of the righteous. If you restrict the duration of one, you must restrict the duration of the other. The same language too is used to denote the duration of the Divine existence. And there is just as much probability, as far as the



language is concerned, that He will cease to exist as the punishment of the wicked will cease. The very same argument that would terminate the punishment of the wicked, would prove that the Divine Being would cease to exist.

We cite some additional proof that the very same language that is used to represent the condition of the finally impenitent in the future world, is used to denote the eternity of the blessedness of the righteous in heaven. The text already quoted Matth. xxv, 46, is in point. Here the same word used to denote the duration of the life of the righteous, is the word used to denote the duration of the punishment of the wicked. And on this text we have the celebrated Dr. Clarke in our favor. Again, Luke xvi, 9, "And I say unto you, make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." Again, 2 Cor. iv, 17, 18. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." Chapt. v, 1st verse. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." We might multiply this proof, but forbear.

Now the very same language is used with reference to the finally impenitent. We refer you again to the language of our Lord to the blasphemer against the Holy Ghost. The blasphemer is threatened with *eternal damnation*. Again, 2 Thess. i, 9, "Who shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." And mark this is connected with the raising the dead and changing the living. Also, Jude 6, 7. "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he has reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, in like manner giving themselves over

to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."

Now you see that the same language that is used to express the duration of the happiness of the righteous in heaven, and the duration of the existence of God is used to express the duration of the punishment of the wicked. After the burning of the visible world, after the resurrection of the dead and the changing of the living, after the assembling of all nations at the bar of God, after the case of every individual is decided according to his moral character, after all this, the unholy are to go away into *everlasting punishment*, are described as being *eternally* banished from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power, and cast into hell where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched. Now the great Jehovah that inspired this Book either used the best language in describing the condition of man in the future world or He did not. To say that He erred in the use and application of language in reference to man's eternal destiny is blasphemous. Then we have to admit that He has used the best language, both in regard to the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked. But the very same language that is used to describe the duration of the peace of the righteous in the future world is used to describe the duration of the misery of the wicked in the immortal state. Both are to continue *eternally, everlastingly, forever and ever*. If the gentleman says there are other terms more expressive of endless duration, than the language here used, we have only to say, that this would be to charge the Almighty with a want of wisdom in using the language He has employed. But whether He has used the *best language* or not, He has used the *same language* to express the duration of the punishment of the wicked that He has used to express the duration of the peace of the righteous in the immortal state, and the duration of His own existence.

[Time expired.]

## [MR. DOOLITTLE'S SIXTEENTH REPLY.]

I will now, my friends, in connection with a passing notice of some of our opponent's statements, resume my argument, showing that Matth. 25th. has no reference to man's immortal state of being, and will show that the events spoken of in that chapter have already taken place. In proof of this, we refer you to Matth. xvi. 27, 28, and Matth. xxiv. 29—34, which fixes specifically the time of Christ's coming in the glory of the Father, with the holy angels, to reward every one according to his works, to the lifetime of some of those he was then addressing; and to the generation of men that then lived upon the earth. And as further proof, I will quote Matth. x. 23. "But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another; for verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over all the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come." This language, you see, is explicit. Christ should come during the life-time of his disciples. It was to be in the lifetime of that sinful and adulterous generation that were then on the earth, to whom Christ said, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell," (Gehenna, as it is in the original,) and upon whom Christ said should come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from righteous Able unto the blood of Zacharias, whom they slew—that all should come on that generation for their wickedness. And so it did come on them at Christ's coming in the manner described.

Let us now notice the results of this judgment. I told you, in a former speech, that the rewards spoken of in the latter part of the 23d, and through the 24th and 25th chapters of Matth., were all described in one continued conversation. In the first two of these chapters, Christ is speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dispersion of the Jewish nation. And he opens the 24th chapter, which continues the conversation, with the adverb *then*. *When* the events he has been speaking of shall take place, *then* his kingdom, the Gospel kingdom, the kingdom of heaven, shall be likened unto ten virgins, &c. He goes

on to describe the state of his kingdom at the time ; first, by the parable of the ten virgins ; secondly, by the parable of the talents ; and thirdly, by the parable of the sheep and the goats. But this language is to be understood *figuratively*, and not *literally*. If it be understood literally, then literal sheep are to be placed on the right hand of the Son of God, and literal goats on his left. But our friend will not contend for this, we presume.

But I wish you to mark how this scene opens. “*When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.*” Now when was this coming? We have already shown conclusively that this coming was to take place during the life-time of some he was then addressing, during the life-time of the generation of man then on the earth.

Christ refers here to his coming to show the condition of his followers in that stage of his mediatorial kingdom, which he had set up in the earth. “*He shall sit upon the throne of his glory;*” that is, upon his mediatorial throne ; “*And before him shall be gathered all nations.*” By this time the Gospel was preached to all nations then known. And they were to be separated as sheep and goats—the sheep on the right hand and the goats on the left. By the sheep, are meant those who received the Gospel. By the goats, are meant those who rejected the Gospel, and received the displeasure of their judge. Then he says to the believers, “*Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world;*” i. e. the Gospel kingdom ; and gave the reasons, “*For I was a-hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me,*” for this invitation, to wit—that they had discharged their moral obligations to God and man. But the unbelievers were not thus favored, for they had neglected to do all these things which the blessed had done. Now, you see that this judgment was to transpire at the coming of Christ, during the life-time of those who heard him, and retribution was meted out according to the good or the bad works of the creature. But we have

proved from the word of God, that the salvation of men in the future world is not predicated on good works at all, but on the grace of God. But here, in the passage we are examining, the salvation and condemnation are predicated on good and bad works of men in this world, such as discharging, or neglecting to discharge, the obligations we owe to God and our fellow men. Now this cannot be our happiness in heaven, for this is never promised as a reward for our good deeds on earth; it is predicated wholly on the grace of God. So, on the other hand, for neglecting these things, some were condemned; but this cannot be a final condemnation in the future world, for the same reason that rewards predicated on good works cannot mean the final happiness of the righteous. All this, then, can have no reference to a future world.

When we get home to heaven, shall we be welcomed there because of our good deeds in this world! Will we feel that we merit heaven for our good works? No; we shall realize that our salvation is all of grace. Those who do good works here are happy as the reward of them, and the Savior calls them blessed. Those who believe on Christ are happy. "He that believeth on me *hath everlasting life*." But he that believeth not is condemned already. The unbelieving Jews were sorely punished for their unbelief. But this punishment was not to reach into an immortal state of being. For their wickedness, the Jews were punished as no nation was punished before, and never will be punished again, and this punishment has followed them to this day—but it is not to be endless, for Paul says, Rom. xi. 25—"For I would not, brethren, that you should be ignorant of this mystery, (lest ye be wise in your own conceits:) that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved," &c. So the Apostle goes on to the end of the chapter, speaking of the abounding mercies of God, whose "gifts and callings are without repentance." So you see that these punishments are all to be taken away, together with their consequences. You will mark too, that the "fulness of the Gentiles" shall be brought in, which means the conversion and salvation of

the whole Gentile world. Hence, you see that we have here both Jews and Gentiles, embracing all nations, the entire human race, as the subjects of salvation. Now, this puts a negative on our friend's position on his affirmative.

But we have not quite done with the 25th chapter of Matth. As it respects this *everlasting punishment* and the *life eternal*. I have shown that "this is life eternal, that they should know the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he has sent." "He that believeth on me *hath* everlasting life." And we have shown that *everlasting punishment* was the punishment visited on the unbelieving Jews at the destruction of Jerusalem, and that it does not continue beyond this life.

But one argument used by our friend, is the fact that the word used to denote the duration of the life of the righteous, is the same word used to express the duration of the punishment of the wicked, and that the punishment of the wicked is to exist as long as the happiness of the righteous. This argument supposes that sin is to exist as long as good exists. But good is opposed to sin, and He wills the redemption of man from sin, and wills the destruction of sin, and every principle of moral evil.

Now, from the very object and design of punishment, and the nature of sin, we know that sin and its punishment cannot exist forever. The object of punishment is disciplinary. It is inflicted for the good of the individual.—This is the true meaning of the original Greek word *kolasin*, translated *punishment*, Matth. xxv. 46, and it is used to represent the process of chastisement that trees undergo to make them more fruitful.\* So, when used to represent punishment, it means that kind of punishment which results in good. This agrees with what Paul says: "For they," (our fathers in the flesh,) "hereby for a few days chastened us after their pleasure; but He," (our Heavenly Father,) "for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless, it afterwards yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness unto them

\* See Grotius and Fuffendor for the Text.

which are exercised thereby." Hence, you see the object of punishment. It is that we might become partakers of his holiness, and produce the peaceable fruits of righteousness. But this cannot be the case, if the definition our friend gives of punishment is correct; for there is no *afterwards* to endless punishment. Such a punishment can never work such happy results as the Bible declares shall be the result of punishment; nor can it be inflicted for good. It is an immortal curse upon the unregenerated, evil without hope or remedy. But I am glad that Paul's doctrine is more merciful than our friend Power's; for he says that God chastises us that we might be partakers of his holiness, and enjoy the fruits of righteousness.

Now, in conclusion, to prove the everlasting falsehood of endless punishment, I quote Lam. iii. 31—33. "For the Lord will not cast off forever: But though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies. For he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." Is. lvii. 16. "For I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth: for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." The Lord will not contend forever—that is, he will not punish forever, and he gives the reason, "for the spirit would fail before me;" it could not endure it forever. Now I would ask our friend if he can give you a good a reason why punishment should be endless, as the Almighty has given why it shall not be endless? The next time I have the floor, I will give a critical examination of the term *everlasting*. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. POWER'S SEVENTEENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Judges and this Serious Congregation.*—I will just observe on the gentleman's quotations from Lam. and Isa. that you will see in reading these texts in their connection, they have a *condition*, and specify the character with whom God will not always contend. This is all we need say on them now.

In reference to the punishment mentioned in Matt. xxv. 46, being merely disciplinary, we will give a paragraph

from his favorite author Dr. Clarke on this passage. "And they shall go away into everlasting punishment"—"No appeal, no remedy to all eternity! No *end* to the punishment of those whose *final* impenitence manifests in them an eternal *will* and *desire* to sin. By dying in a *settled opposition* to God they cast themselves into a *necessity* of continuing in an *eternal aversion* from him. But some are of opinion that this punishment shall have an *end*: this is as likely as that the glory of the righteous shall have an *end*: for the same word is used to express the *duration* of the punishment, *kolasin aionion*, as is used to express the duration of the state of glory: *zoen aionion*. I have seen the best things that have been written in favor of the final redemption of damned spirits: but I never saw an answer to the argument against that doctrine, drawn from this verse, but what sound learning and criticism should be ashamed to acknowledge. The original word *aion*, is certainly to be taken here in its proper grammatical sense, *continued being*, *aiei on* NEVER ENDING. Some have gone a *middle way*, and think that the wicked shall be *annihilated*. This, I think, is contrary to the text: if they *go into punishment* they *continue to exist*: for that which *ceases to be*, *ceases to suffer*."

The gentleman has resolved this whole scene described in this chapter, into things that transpired in the gospel kingdom about the time Jerusalem was destroyed. Now this interpretation contradicts common sense and matters of fact. That a period has ever transpired when God gathered all nations before Him and separated them as here described, no one can believe. It contradicts matters of fact. Hence we are compelled to reject the interpretation.

His remarks relative to *salvation by works* are equally feeble with his other observations on the text. It is all mere assumption that the salvation spoken of in this text is a salvation by works or merit. And we have never maintained that man is saved by the merit of works. But works of faith and love are a *condition* which God has made on the observance of which, man may obtain eternal life or happiness. No one can have salvation in the future



world without fulfilling this condition. But the fact that man enters upon eternal life by fulfilling this condition does not imply that he is saved *by the merit of his good works*.

His idea that going into life eternal is entering the gospel kingdom bears its own refutation on its face. For it is saying in reference to believers—good people who are already saved, and that need no salvation, the gospel kingdom comes in and saves them!! This is an absurdity.—Just the opposite is the truth. The gospel comes to men in their sins and leads them to repentance and saves them.

We have adduced, under the several heads of the argument, specimens of divine testimony, abridging as much as we could conveniently, and will now close the proof on our affirmative, and leave the gentleman to examine them as he wishes.

With this statement we will now redeem our pledge, to examine the proof texts of our respondent, that he kept back while on his affirmative. We have before adverted to the reasons of this strange course, but make no complaint on this head. He said he had many texts to bring, and we assured him when he would inform us that he had got through with them, we would meet them all, but he has not given us the information and we now turn aside to meet all he has brought.

You will recollect that on Saturday we used the texts—“He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.” “And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” And showed that a man dying in his sins, dies with the wrath of God abiding on him, and that it is then impossible for him ever to believe or exercise gospel faith in Christ; for in the future world all is knowledge and sight and there is no room for saving gospel faith there. We also proved that faith which “works by love and purifies the heart,” is the only condition by which the sinner can avoid the miseries of hell and secure heaven. And we now remark on this point, that God has either *forbidden* man’s faith and holiness as a

*condition* of his salvation in heaven, or he is perfectly *indifferent* in regard to faith, or he *commands* faith and holiness as a *condition* of heaven. The gentleman will not say He has forbidden faith, nor that He is indifferent to it. The only alternative then is to admit that He *commands* faith as a condition of salvation in heaven. But he gave us a comment on the gospel mission. He says that the evidence that a man is a believer consists and will consist through all time in the miracles that he may perform.—But it would follow from his reasoning, either, that the gospel is not to be preached at all now, because the preacher cannot work miracles, or that there are no true believers in the world at this day. But this contradicts the Savior, who makes the gospel mission perpetual and universal. This is its general character. But when first published it had a peculiar characteristic—it was characterized by miracles. Jesus Christ wrought many miracles and so did his apostles until the gospel system was fully established and demonstrated to be divine. It was necessary in the first stage of the gospel kingdom that these external evidences of its divinity should accompany it. But as soon as it was fully confirmed to be of God, these external evidences ceased, but its spiritual power to convert and save the soul remained and will to the end of time. So much for the speech based on this passage.

And we now state that the texts the gentleman has adduced from Ps., Lam., Isa. and from every other source, cannot sustain his affirmative,—the purpose for which he adduced them. We put them all together in a mass; and the only question on them is this, is his interpretation, by which he attempts to make them sustain his system, correct? We reply that any interpretation of Scripture that virtually rejects Jesus Christ as the Savior by denying that He saves men from the punishment of sin in the future world, from the punishment of sin in this world, and from the practice of sin in this world, and that attaches natural and human depravity to Jesus Christ, is a false interpretation of the word of God, and as such should be rejected entirely. Now, the gentleman has said that Jesus Christ by all he has done and suffered for our

race, does not save men from punishment in the future world, or in this world. And we have shown that He does not save all men from the practice of sin in this world: for men live and die in all manner of sin,—breath their last breath in the act of crime and in the blackest Atheism. Hence his interpretation of these Scriptures must be utterly false.

Here we remind you of the charge of infidelity and licentiousness in Universalism. And that we would prove it by Mr. Doolittle. You recollect I asked him if Jesus Christ by any thing he has done or suffered for our race, saves man from the danger of punishment in the future world? He answered in the negative. Again, if Christ saves men from the punishment of sin in this world? His answer was "Every sinner is punished in this world according to the multitude and magnitude of his sins." We then referred to matter of fact to show that Christ does not save all men from the practice of sin in this world. Now the conclusion is inevitable. A system that will not allow Jesus Christ to save men from the practice of sin, nor from the punishment of sin, rejects Jesus Christ as a Savior entirely. But the gentleman's system, according to his own admissions, does this and goes farther, it deprives Christ of his Divinity, makes him a created and depraved being.—Hence it is an infidel and licentious system. Mr. Doolittle is my witness.

Again, any interpretation that will release man from all moral obligation and restraint whatever, must be opposed to all moral purity and to every precept of God's word. But his interpretation and application of these texts, he has brought as proof of his affirmative, do release men from every particle of obligation in this world. It does indeed say to men, you will be more happy in this life if you live holy, and practice virtue, but if you choose you may live in violation of all the virtues, you may go on in all the iniquity you please and it makes no difference about your state in the future world, for you are absolutely sure of heaven in spite of all you can do. His interpretation assures man, that it is impossible by the exertion of all his powers both physical and mental, through life and in

death, to commit crime enough to keep him out of heaven. The word of God can never sustain such a system. We know that we state the gentleman's position correctly. And he forgot, when he said he would hand me over into the hand of Mr. Loring, the fact that he had acknowledged the precise position, which his friend had pledged himself to show to be false. The position is, the system maintains that a man cannot commit sin enough in life or in death to keep him out of heaven. We know the Bible maintains no such system. But he has brought these passages to prove such a system. Therefore they afford him no possible support. In these remarks we have rescued them from such a miserable perversion.

We now call the attention of the gentleman to his true position. You will recollect he set out at the commencement, in proof of the holiness and happiness of the entire human race, in a state of immortality, (for we are now glancing at his affirmative proof which he held back when on that point,) with the argument from the resurrection. His strong ground was, that all will be changed and fitted for heaven in the resurrection. He afterwards acknowledged that many go into the future world unholy, and he admitted they could not enter heaven unholy, and that if men are unholy they must be unhappy. He likewise admitted that persons are in a conscious state of existence from death till the resurrection. Thus far he came in answer to my interrogations. Now you see his true attitude is to leave them in misery, from death till the resurrection. So he really is the witness by which we have proved future punishment. But he begged leave to be excused from answering our question, whether those that have gone into the future world in sin were miserable till the resurrection; and, seeing the difficulty, he undertook to change his position on the point.

Now any interpretation of scripture that will put a man into such an attitude—that makes him contradict himself, by admitting that millions are suffering in the future world, and must suffer from death till the resurrection, and yet denies all punishment in the future world, must be a perversion of the word of God—throwing the word of God

into utter confusion, and we are compelled to reject it as infidel and licentious, from centre to circumference.

Having adduced sufficient proof on our affirmative, examined all his proofs, and fully refuted his positions, we now await the gentleman's pleasure with regard to making his closing speech. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S SEVENTEENTH REPLY.]

I now proceed to notice some proof texts of my friend, lest he should say I was not willing to notice them all.—You recollect he quoted Dr. Clarke on Matth. xxv, 46, Now we brought forward Dr. Clarke on some proof texts in his expositions, of which he teaches the doctrine of the ultimate holiness and happiness of all men as strongly as it can be taught. As a specimen I gave you his remarks on Rom. v. 21, in which the doctrine of universal salvation is taught in as strong terms as it is possible to express it. Among others equally strong, and made to include the whole race of man, he says, "Thus we find that the salvation from sin here, is as extensive and complete, as the *guilt and contamination* of sin; *death is conquered, hell disappointed, the devil confounded, and sin totally destroyed!*"

Now, because he gives another doctrine on Matth. xxv, it does not weaken my argument at all. I showed you conclusively that that chapter has reference entirely to this world; that the events described were all fulfilled. I showed you that the object and design of punishment, from its very nature, precludes the idea of its being future, and then to refute for ever our friend's position, I quoted the declarations of Jehovah, "I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." Then I said if he would give as good a reason why God should contend and punish for ever as Jehovah has that he will not, I would then admit he had sustained his position. I likewise quoted from Lam. iii. 31—33, to show that the Lord does not afflict willingly, and that he will not cast off for ever. And though he cause grief for a time, He

wilt have compassion according to the multitude of His mercies. These texts prove that God will not punish any one endlessly.

I have shown that the object of punishment is disciplinary, and therefore cannot be endless. Many contend that the punishment spoken of in Matth. xxv. 46, is endless. But why is it contended that it is endless? Because the term everlasting is connected with it. But does this prove that it is endless? No. No term in the Bible is used with more latitude of meaning than this term. We can only determine the length of time denoted by the term everlasting, by the nature and duration of the thing with which it is connected. "The everlasting hills," will not exist eternally, but as long as the earth exists. Some of the statutes of Moses were called everlasting, but they passed away, so with many things termed everlasting, they have passed away. So where there is nothing in the nature of the thing with which it is connected to make it eternal, it must be understood in a limited sense. Here, in this case, we find it connected with *punishment*. Now punishment is for the good of those punished, and this cannot be endless; for it is designed to produce the peaceable fruits of righteousness. Hence, endless punishment is at war with the nature and design of punishment. It therefore must be understood in a limited sense. This settles the question.

Our friend quoted 2d Thes. i. 7—10, which contains this. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Now does our friend understand that this means, literally, that any shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord? If it means this, then it proves *annihilation*, and not *endless punishment*. For where can the individual be in the universe, and not be in the presence of the Lord? Says the Psalmist, Psa. cxxxix. 7, 8, "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there."

If our friend Power now wishes to close this discussion

and sum up the whole argument before the people, I have no objection.

[MR. POWER'S EIGHTEENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen.*—A few words in reply to my friend's last speech.

You recollect his insinuation that I was laboring under conviction. Of course if he is correct I am consummately hypocritical before you. If his system requires such a course of argumentation, it is only in accordance with what I have stated several times—it imposes a fearful task on its advocates.

The first thing I notice is an assertion which he made and on which he rested the plausibility of his remarks.—He says, God's punishment is all disciplinary. This was his foundation and on this he built a regular sophism. That this position is absolutely false will be easily shown. Was the punishment of the antediluvian world reformatory? No. It placed them beyond the reach of reformation. Was the punishment of the Sodomites reformatory? It placed them beyond the reach of all reform. So with other cases which have been mentioned, and thousands more which might be, the punishment was not disciplinary in any degree. No—the contrary is the truth. Hence his assumption is false.

If he has assumed his position ignorantly, we presume you will not trust him as a prophet—as he has assumed this character several times during this discussion. If he knew better, then there may have been a design to mislead in reference to his conclusion.

In relation to *Thess.*, respecting the "destruction from the presence of the Lord," &c., he wanted to know whether this is literal or figurative. He tried to make it appear that it could not be literal, for God is omnipotent.—But this language is both literal and figurative. The facts described are of such a character that figurative language has to be employed.

He endeavored to throw a plausibility around another assumption—that being banished from the presence of the

Lord, and from the glory of his power, must mean being banished from the Temple of Jerusalem. We ask, to whom was the Apostle writing here? To the Jews of the metropolis? No. But to the Gentiles, who, most likely, had never been in, or seen the Temple. He was writing to those living under another government, whose locality was quite remote from Jerusalem. And it is absurd to suppose that the Apostle would use such an argument to them. Now to such assertions as this the gentleman resorts to keep up appearances.

One remark more, with reference to his criticism on the term *everlasting*. He says we can never determine the meaning of the term everlasting, by the objects with which it is connected. But he says, punishment is not eternal, therefore the adjective *everlasting* cannot mean eternal or endless. Here again he has *assumed* (not proved) his premises.

What is it with which the *everlasting punishment* is connected? It is the immortal and personal consciousness of the soul. Now if the soul, in its constitution and nature, is immortal, and endless in its existence, if it is separated from the favor of God, which alone can make it happy, it necessarily suffers, and will endlessly suffer, for it never can cease to exist. So, on the gentleman's own rule of criticism on this term—that it continues as long as the existence of the object with which it is connected—we show it to be endless. For the object of the punishment is the immortal soul. 'His banishment of the soul from the favor of God, and its eternal misery in the future world, is the second death.

[It was now too late to sum up this afternoon, and it was concluded to adjourn till morning. At which time Mr. Doolittle said he would occupy not more than five minutes in reply to the last speech, and then proceed to make his closing speech. In the morning, however, instead of five, he occupied twenty-five minutes, which occasioned considerable debate between the speakers, and led Mr. Power to claim the privilege of a reply, before they proceeded to make their closing speeches. Mr. Power's reply occupied twenty minutes.]



WEDNESDAY, AUG. 6—9 O'CLOCK, A. M.

## [MR. DOOLITTLE'S EIGHTEENTH REPLY.]

*Messrs. Moderators and the Audience.*—You recollect I said last evening that I would notice one or two passages of Scripture I had not noticed, and then proceed to sum up my arguments.

The passage that I have not noticed is recorded in Jude 7. "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, in like manner giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." Our friend quoted this text as having reference to the condition of man in the future world. I deny that it has any reference to an immortal state of existence. The Apostle is carrying his hearers back to the destruction of the cities of the plain on account of their great wickedness, stating the reason why those cities perished, and pointing to the monuments of ruin they presented, as a striking exhibition of God's judgments upon such a wicked people. But you will mark, it was in this world that they received those judgments, not in the future world. Now any thing set forth for the benefit of the living, must be something recognizable by the senses. But our friend's interpretation would deprive us of this; for he places the scene in an immortal state, where no mind can take cognizance of the condition of mortal beings. The fire here has no reference to a lake of literal fire and brimstone in the eternal world. Because it is called eternal fire does not prove that it never ceases. As I said, we must determine such terms by their use. They are used to express all periods of time, from three hours to an endless state of existence. Here the nature of the object or institution must decide the duration. "The everlasting hills," we believe, will cease to be. So many things have ceased, which were styled everlasting. Now we have said that this fire is connected with punishment; and, therefore, must be under-

stood in a limited sense. I have clearly shown that the declared object of punishment is for the benefit of the punished. And the moment you say God punishes a being without designing to do him good, you make it amount to revenge. Now the position I take is, no good can result from the endless punishment of any being. It is cruelty, not justice. However, there will be no such punishment. I proved to you that the punishment was disciplinary. I quoted from Paul. He defines the object of our chastisement. He says that "God chastises us for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness." And afterwards he says, "It yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness." I quoted from Isa. lvii. 16. "For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made, &c." Lam. iii. 31—33. "For the Lord will not cast off for ever; for though He cause grief, yet will he have compassion, according to the multitude of his mercies. For he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." I contend, now, that these passages, if there were no other in the Bible, are sufficient to show that the object of the punishment is disciplinary; and consequently, it cannot be endless in duration.

But I must notice a remark our friend made on 2d Thes. i. 7—10, respecting the "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord." I said this text was parallel with Matth. xxv. 46, and showed that both had reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the banishment of the Jews from the Temple, &c. But my friend tried to make my position ridiculous, by saying the Apostle is writing to individuals at a great distance from Jerusalem. But to show that my position is right, I will spend a little more time on this passage.

If you will read several verses in connection here, you will see that the church at Thessalonica was greatly persecuted, so that it was a righteous thing in God to come out in judgment against their persecutors. Now who were their most inveterate persecutors? The Jews. They had an inveterate hatred against the Messiah and all who believed in him, and they went through the whole coun-

try persecuting the christians. Wherever the Apostles went they found some of the Jews ready to persecute them.

Now these persecutors were to be punished wherever they were found; whether they lived at Jerusalem or a thousand miles from the city.

To show you that the Jews of this place were persecutors, I quote Acts xvii. 13. "But when the Jews of Thessalonica had knowledge that the word of God was preached of Paul at Berea, they came thither also and stirred up the people."

Now the Apostle is speaking of these persecuting Jews, it is perfectly evident. The gentleman says it has no reference to the Jews, but he must be mistaken.

The Jews supposed the presence of God was particularly manifested in the Temple at Jerusalem. Hence, when they prayed they turned their faces towards Jerusalem. Now, when the Temple should be destroyed they would be driven from the presence of the Lord. The whole Jewish nation would be afflicted, whether they were in Jerusalem or not, for the nation should be dispersed among all nations, and could no longer have a Temple to look to, in which was manifested the presence of the Lord; and they should become a reproach and a by-word among all nations, and should be abused and trodden down, even as they are at this day. But still I proved to you from Rom. xi. 25, 26, that this will not be endless, but after the fullness of the Gentiles are brought in all Israel shall be saved.

I have but one thing more to notice. The gentleman said his argument of endless punishment was drawn from the fact that the soul is immortal, and the soul will exist endlessly; therefore, the punishment may be endless.—Now this is one of the strongest positions I ever heard a man take, much less a divine of the pretensions of our friend. On his position, all punishment designed for the soul, must be endless, and to talk of any kind of punishment of man being limited, is to talk nonsense.

But this position is at war with the position that I have sustained from the Bible, to wit: The design of punishment is disciplinary. God says he will not always be wroth, nor contend for ever, because the spirit should fail

before him, and the souls which he had made. And you know I quoted, "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." Hence, this text is not to be understood literally. This is a parallel text with Matth. xxv. 46. Mark this, and it refers to the national punishment of the Jews, and their banishment from the Temple worship. This destruction and punishment resulted in the destruction of the legal dispensation, and their dispersion among all nations.—The Jews, as a nation, were banished from the presence of the Lord in the Temple. But this punishment will not be endless, as we have shown. When the fullness of the Gentiles shall come in, then "all Israel shall be saved."

With respect to Rev. xx. 12—15, in regard to the lake of fire and brimstone, &c. I occupied nearly thirty minutes yesterday in illustrating and showing that this is used in a figurative sense. This shows a process of purification, and not of damnation. All dross, and death, and hell shall be destroyed. Here the last enemy, death, shall be destroyed. It will result in the destruction of every principle of evil, and the purification of the whole human family. Then I say, as you can perceive, this text has no reference to punishment in an immortal state of existence.

And I tell you now, as I have told you before, that our friend will not be able to sustain the affirmative of his question. And, my friends, if I had made as poor a defence of my cause, or any cause under heaven that I had espoused, as my friend has made here on his cause, I never would lift my voice in favor of it again. I would despair for ever of maintaining it. Not that he is not as capable as any other man, for he is; and I have given him the credit of this. But as I told you in the outset, though there are many things that may be proved from the Bible, there is one thing that never has and never can be proved from it, that is, the endless and hopeless suffer-

ing of any being that God has made. For this would defeat the whole design of God—in creation.

It is God's purpose to save all mankind, and in forming this purpose, Dr. Clarke will tell you he did not consult men, angels or devils. He purposed for his own glory to save all. And all the powers of heaven, earth, and hell, and all other *powers* combined, will never be able to defeat the benevolent plan of God. It is true, the whole world fell into sin. But remember, a full remedy has been provided for sin, and this our friend has admitted.—He admits that Jesus Christ has atoned for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual. But he does not admit that all will receive the benefit of this atonement. Paul goes farther than our friend Power, he says, "That as sin hath reigned unto death, EVEN so might grace reign, through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." Here he teaches that the reign of grace shall be as extensive as the reign of sin, which is *universal*. And in view of this, Dr. Clarke shouts Halleluiah! Amen, and Amen; and I called upon my friend to shout, but he did not shout aloud, nor even say *amen* without shouting.

Now I firmly believe, without saying another word for the benefit of our friend, that he is now laboring under conviction, and is now travelling in spiritual birth, and I hope he will have a safe and happy spiritual deliverance. I challenged our friend to give as good a reason why punishment should be endless, as God has given to the contrary, but his reason has not been given. The issue on this is between him and Jehovah. And he says when an individual takes a position in opposition to Jehovah he must be wrong. Then let God be true, though every man, including our friend Power, be found a liar.

One remark, and I close this branch of the argument, i. e. that my leading position has been that this world, or the present, is a state of retribution. I shall refer to this in my closing speech. As farther proof of this position, I now quote Jer. xxiii. 5, 6. You will bear in mind that our friend has contended, which I have not denied, that God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, and that that day I have contend-

ed was the Gospel day, included the whole Mediatorial reign. I now bring forward this testimony in addition, which I have had marked several days, but have not had an opportunity to present it. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper; and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called, **THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.**" Christ's reign, I again observe, commences with the Gospel dispensation, and continues to its close, and here the prophet says of Christ, He "reigns and prospers, and shall execute judgment and justice *in the earth.*"

The argument, my friends, on my part, is at an end.

[MR. POWER'S NINETEENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators.* — My friend's remarks were based principally on my quotation from the epistle of Jude, 7th v. The case of the Sodomites suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. He based his argument again on the assumption so often refuted, that all punishment in this world is disciplinary. This is an assumption that no man will make unless merely for a show of defence when his system is in the agonies of death and likely soon to expire. I asked the gentleman when on the floor before, how the punishment of the Sodomites was disciplinary? Reformation is ceasing to do evil and learning to do well, taking up the cross, feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, loving God with all the heart and our neighbor as ourselves, and living in the practical discharge of all our duties. I asked him how the Sodomites and numerous other sinners who were cut off in a moment under the judgments of God, were reformed, or how their punishment could have been disciplinary? The gentleman knows that this is an absurdity that can scarcely have a parallel.

He said the judgment of God fell on the Sodomites as a chastisement for their abominable wickedness—for he saw there could be no reformation. His argument is, they be-

came so corrupt that they were too vile and degraded to live on the earth, so God removed them off to heaven.—Then his course of argument says to the wicked, if you wish to gain heaven sooner than you otherwise would, all you have to do is to become such abominable sinners that you are not fit to live on earth, and God will take you to heaven.

But to give it another gloss—for you see that my friend was greatly excited and confused, he says, they were set forth suffering the vengeance of eternal fire as an example to other nations. How, he asks, can any thing be set forth as an example unless it is a visible matter?

We ask the people of Laport whether they ever saw those cities? They never have. Then how do they know those cities ever existed? God's word tells them so. But this is only one item that God's word records, which we are required to believe. It says, that after those cities were destroyed, and all their inhabitants perished, their souls are suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. And this example to us, rests on precisely the same evidence that the destruction of the cities does—the word of God. This is the ground on which our faith rests in regard to this example of the souls of the Sodomites suffering the vengeance of eternal fire, under the administration of God's moral government.

A word in reference to the gentleman's perversion of the doctrine he opposes, that it holds to a punishment administered for vengeance. For any punishment that does not have the good of the individual punished in view is, he says, a punishment for vengeance. Then he convicts all Judges on their bench; for it is a fact that no good accrues to the individual punished with death, and the judge has no idea that the punishment will do the culprit any good.—[Mr. Doolittle here said he was misrepresented, that his position was that any punishment, that was not designed for the good of the punished or of somebody else, was revengeful.] The substance is the same. And we add that the infinite Judge of all the earth will do right. And whenever he inflicts punishment either temporal or eternal it is right.

On this passage in Jude, I have the authority of my friend's highly commended Dr. Clarke. He says, it both expresses the literal destruction of the inhabitants of the cities, and also the destiny of the soul in the future world where the punishment will be endless.

On the quotation from Thess. and "destruction from the presence of the Lord,"—the gentleman tried to avoid if possible, or throw off the force of the absurd position in which he placed himself, viz, that the Apostle would address the church of Thessalonica, and endeavor to comfort them and have them rejoice notwithstanding their persecution, for the time would come, at some future period, in which the Lord would come and punish a class of sinners in Jerusalem at a great distance from them. The gentleman sees the absurdity of such a position, and so tries to make it appear that it was the Jews at Thessalonica that were to be punished with the rest of their nation. But the Apostle was not speaking about the Jews here. It was not the Jews that persecuted the church there at that time—and this can be shown from Paul himself. 1 Thess. ii. 14, 15, "For ye brethren, became the followers of the churches of God which in Judea are in Christ Jesus; for ye also have suffered like things of your *own countrymen*, even as they have of the Jews; who both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets and have persecuted us; and they please not God and are contrary to all men." Now if the gentleman wishes to say they were persecuted by the Jews he will contradict Paul, for he says they were persecuted by their own countrymen, the Gentiles. Paul says it has no reference to the Temple. For those to whom he was writing never worshipped in the Temple, and knew nothing about the presence of the Lord being manifest in it.

The gentleman's remarks with regard to the immortality of the soul will come up appropriately in my review. We expected that he would be surprised at our position on this point, because he and others have made our position for us here, which however we do not feel bound to take. They say we must find some local place, or hell, some place which we can show will never cease to be. But we have only to find, on the authority of the Bible, an immortal Spirit, un-



holy and at enmity to God, and placed beyond the bounds of this probationary scene without the possibility of a change, and then we have endless misery or endless punishment.

[MR. DOOLITTLE'S NINETEENTH, AND CLOSING SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Judges.*—I will sum up my arguments as briefly as possible, and in as condensed point of view as I am able, in the order they have been adduced in the discussion of the second question on the table. And, in doing so, I would claim your serious and candid attention. You will remember at the outset, and from time to time, during the discussion, I manifested a desire that you should pay due deference to the arguments produced. To let all arguments have their full weight, in favor of our position or in favor of the position taken by our friend. The first position taken by Mr. Power, was this, that under the moral government of God, man is threatened, for his sins, with punishment or suffering that cannot be endured in the present world, and of necessity, must extend into the future world. In opposition to this position, I adduced first, the following argument or position: The present world is a state of retribution; rewards and punishments are meted out in this world according to merit and demerit. And, secondly, the judgment which I admit, is a universal judgment, resulting in rewarding all men according to their works, which, our friend said was all future, involving the endless destiny of the righteous and the wicked, I proved was in this world. In proof of the first position, my argument was, that the history of our race, the observation of every man, the experience of every rational individual, and the Bible, and reason, all united to establish the fact that the present is a state of retribution; that the righteous are here rewarded according to their works, and the wicked punished according to their deeds. As farther proof from the Scripture, I quoted this text—“Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner. And moreover, I saw under the sun the place of judgment, that wickedness

was there. I said in mine heart God shall judge the righteous and the wicked; for there is a time for every purpose and for every work." Says the Psalmist, "verily there is a God that judgeth in the earth. Let the floods clap their hands, let the hills be joyful together before the Lord, for he cometh to judge the earth; with righteousness shall he judge the world, and the people with equity." Again: I proved the judgment commenced with Christ's Mediatorial reign and would continue to its close—that the day which God had appointed to judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ, included the Mediatorial reign of Christ, and that before he gave up the kingdom to the Father that he might become all in all, judgment would pass on all men. Hence, our Savior declares now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be judged. And the prophet says of Christ, "He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he has set judgment in the earth. And the isles shall wait for his law." I proved that rewards were meted out to the righteous in the present life. My proofs were these: "Her (wisdom's) ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace. And the work of righteousness is peace, and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance for ever. Great peace have all they that love thy law, and nothing shall offend them. But glory, honor, and peace to every one that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile. And on the other hand, I showed that, "Unto them who are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first and also of the Gentile." "The way of the transgressor is hard. But the wicked are like the troubled sea, that cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace to the wicked." I showed from our own observation and experience, that virtue's prize is the soul's calm sunshine and the heartfelt joy. That the innocent, the upright and the good enter into rest; that they have the peace of God, which passeth all understanding; but that the wicked are full of trouble, and vexation, and anguish of soul, on account of their guilt, continually.

Now, these were the arguments, and many more might have been adduced, to show that the present is a state of retribution; that rewards and punishments are meted out in this life according to the merit and demerit of each individual. In addition to this, I adduced this passage—"Be not deceived; God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting." My argument on this was, that a man reaps his harvest in the same field in which he sows his seed. No one sows grain here, and reaps the harvest in Asia or Africa, but in the same field in which he sows, and the harvest will partake of the nature of the seed sown. Hence I showed, according to the declaration of the Apostle here, that he that soweth in the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption in the flesh, and not out of it. He that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting. The fruit of the spirit consists of "love, joy, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance."

"Against such there is no law." On the other hand, the fruits of the flesh are, idolatry, hatred, variance, wrath, strife, seditions, murders, drunkenness, and such like. The retribution is all spoken of in this world. The christian will not sow to the spirit in the future world; he sows to the spirit in this world, and consequently he must reap the fruits of the spirit in this world—reap his harvest in the field in which he sows his seed. The sinner will not sow to the flesh in the future world; he sows in this world, and consequently he must reap in this world. Our friend, you will remember, brought up various passages of Scripture to show that we are all under the government of God; held amenable to the judgment in an immortal state of existence. He relied much on the 25th of Matth. for his proof, but quoted in connection, from Cor. "For we must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." You remember I said this passage taught a universal judgment, and that all would be rewarded or punished accord-

ing to their deeds. But this judgment, I said, had reference to the present, and not to the future world. This I showed was plain, from the language, (leaving out the words in italics, which obscure the sense,) that every one may receive the things in body according to that he hath done, &c. He is to receive *in body*, and not out of the body. Hence, the judgment must be in this world, and not in the future world.

And in respect to the other proof texts, I challenged the gentleman, repeatedly, to fix his finger on one passage which asserted that there would be a judgment in the future world. Matth. xxv. 46, and a passage from Thess. were his strongest proofs. But do they prove his affirmative? No. They do not reach beyond the shores of mortality. This I showed in my argument.

Again: I proved that God had a good design in punishing man, and that his punishments must be disciplinary. They must either benefit the punished, or be a benefit to others. But endless punishment cannot benefit any one. Hence, it is not founded in goodness, cannot be from God, and the doctrine must be false. Paul declares that God chastises for our profit, that we may be partakers of his holiness; and notwithstanding for the present it was grievous, yet afterwards it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness. And hence, from the very nature of punishment, under the divine government of God, it must be limited, for it is intended to work out in all who are punished, the peaceable fruits of righteousness. And God says, "I will not contend forever: neither will I be always wroth, lest the spirit should fail before me, and the souls I have made." "For the Lord will not cast off forever, but though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies, for he doth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men." I told you that God's declaration that he *would not cast off forever, nor contend forever*, and our friend's assertion that He would, were diametrically opposed, and one must be false. And the conclusion of my argument was, that we had better place confidence in God, than in the assertion of our friend Power. The position our friend took in con-

nection with these arguments, was, that men went out of this world unholy, in a state of sin and unbelief, and inasmuch as they were not punished in this world, and as there was no possibility of a change in the future world, they must of necessity remain in circumstances of misery for eternity. My reply to this was, that the best of men, of christians, and even our friend Power not excepted, would leave this world with some moral defilement attached to them; some small remains at least, and if some change for the better were not made at death, or after death, they would be eternally excluded from heaven and holiness in the future world; for nothing can enter therein the least defiled; and if this change could pass on men to a small degree, it could extend to any degree—for the arm of Jehovah is not shortened, that it cannot save, or that he cannot purify and make holy, in the future world, even the chief of sinners.

You recollect I quoted from the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, which taught the doctrine that even the best christians might have some of this moral defilement about them to the latest period of their lives. Now, there must be some change in them for the better, or they could not enter heaven. Hence, the conclusion was, that as we were all in this condition, we must all rely on the mighty power of God, which would, as is promised, clothe us with incorruption, and glory, and honor, in the resurrection, and make us "equal unto the angels;" as our Savior says, equal in purity and peace, and make us the "children of God, being children of the resurrection, and not subject to death any more," for "death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed." Here, you recollect, the gentleman charged on our system repeatedly, that it held that the sinner could not commit sin enough in this world to shut him out of heaven in the future world. But I showed, if he held that a man could become such a sinner that the infinite mercy of God could not save him, he was at issue with Paul. For he says, "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief." And I proved repeatedly, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that all men

will attain that world and the resurrection of the dead, and be clothed with honor, immortality and incorruption, and be equal unto the angels of God, and not subject to death any more. And consequently they would be holy and happy in heaven. All this I proved will be accomplished through the free grace of God. And this purifying grace of God can be just as well imparted to the soul separate from the body, as it can in connection with it.—And if God sees fit to take his creatures out of the world in a state of sin, he does not at all change his character and conduct toward them in the spirit world. And in the article of death, or five minutes after, he can effect a change in the soul as well as before death. And I proved that all, in the end, would have this change from sin to holiness—all would be right. But the gentleman charges us with holding that the bloody and deceitful man might cut his own throat, and as a reward for this we promise him eternal life in the future world. This charge we pronounced slanderous and false, and challenged him to show where we ever preached this, or where it was found in any of our writings. You will recollect, in the progress of the argument in proof of his position, our friend quoted this text—“Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” I proved the word Gehenna, rendered *hell* here, in the original signification had no reference to a place or state of misery in the future world. And I challenged my friend to produce a single solitary term from the Bible, which, in its original signification, meant a place of punishment in the future world; but he was not able to do it. And I now challenge any divine to produce such a word. It is not to be found. Gehenna was the name of a valley south of Jerusalem, in which criminals were sometimes executed and burned—where every thing offensive was thrown from the city, and fires were kept constantly burning to consume it.—Hence, arose the saying in regard to this place, “where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched.”

I showed that the power to be feared, spoken of in the text, was not the Almighty. The context clearly shows

that Christ was warning his disciples not to fear those who would persecute, and scourge, and torture their bodies—the civil power, that had power to inflict these minor punishments—but fear the Sanhedrim, which could not only inflict these punishments, but could, after they had taken the life, burn the body to ashes in Gehenna. This had no reference to the future world.

Again: another main text of our friend, is that of the sin against the Holy Ghost, which the Savior says “has no forgiveness in this world nor in the world to come.” I proved from the testimony of Dr. Clarke that the phrases *this world*, and *the world to come*, mean the Jewish dispensation and the Christian, which was to follow; and that this sin of blasphemy was one of the greatest offences known to the Mosaic law, and subjected the offender to the punishment of death. The law never absolved any one who committed this sin from the death of the body, though the individual might repent and mercy be extended to the soul. This has no reference to the future world.

We said that the doctrine of endless suffering was at war with the doctrine of grace and the design of God’s moral government. Endless suffering is a punishment infinitely disproportioned to the desert of sin. You recollect I showed you that sin, from its very nature, could not deserve endless punishment. For sin is finite, and therefore cannot deserve an unlimited punishment. And the God of Justice would not inflict endless pains for transient crimes. Such a doctrine is at war with every principle of justice and mercy in the universe of God. It is at war with the best principles and feelings of the human heart—at war with the desires and prayers of all christians, of every land. No one can pray for the endless misery of his fellow beings. The idea is horrible to think of. Language cannot describe the terribleness of endless woe! Imagination cannot conceive its horror! For the doctrine maintains that after years unnumbered by all the stars of heaven, and all the grains of sand on the sea shore, by all the spears of grass, by all the leaves of the forest—after all these inconceivable ages, multiplied by millions of millions, have passed away, and this number multiplied by all

the atoms of which our globe is composed have in endless time transpired.—After this should the inquiry be made by a soul in some dark corner of perdition—how long, how long merciful God—how long is my agony yet to continue? The answer would come thrilling back, through the dark caverns of an endless hell: Eternity! Eternity! will not see the end of your sufferings. Why, were all the agonies of all that ever suffered, or ever will suffer yet upon the earth—all combined, it would not amount to what will be endured by one poor soul in this endless hell, for after he had endured more than all that has yet been suffered by all sentient beings in the universe, an endless future would still be before him, through which he must eternally continue to writhe in utter hopelessness, excruciating anguish and woe; and yet it is contended, that this doctrine is founded on God's justice, mercy and benevolence! But I tell you as I have all along told you, that it throws a dark and impenetrable cloud over the Divine character. It hides all that is to be adored in Deity, it shrouds the world in gloom, and clothes the heavens in sackcloth, and it would fill all heaven with lamentation and mourning!! This doctrine I repeat is one of the most horrible that the human mind can conceive, and it must have arisen in the dark ages of the world, when the most cruel and malignant passions of men ruled: When the injured party not being able fully to glut his fiendish and malicious hate, on his victim here, conceived during his maddening fit of revenge, inflamed to the highest pitch, of an endless hell in the future world, in which he could satiate his fell revenge, by the thought that his enemy would suffer for ever and ever world without end. Such is the nature of this doctrine. It is at war with the justice of God, and with every principle of His government. This doctrine maintains that in as much as the sinner in his ignorance, and folly and darkness, has concluded to go on in sin through life, when he goes into the future world, God will apprentice him to the devil, where of necessity he will continue in sin, and blaspheme to all eternity—where a possibility of bettering his condition will be eternally excluded. Do you not my friends see the awful nature of this doctrine? You



will recollect that when good old Job was called to test his integrity, and when his afflictions were so great, his own wife seemed to turn against him, and said dost thou still retain thine integrity? Curse God and die. But oh no, he knew the character of God, and the character of His Government. And had the fullest confidence that this scene of affliction would not last always. That that dark impenetrable cloud that now hung over him, would pass away ere long, and the light of God's countenance would again beam upon him, and he should be fully compensated for all his affliction: Well so it was, we said to you, proving most emphatically, that Job's last days were his best days. He was rewarded double for all he had suffered. And both show this was in accordance with the character and mercy of God, and the principles of his moral government. This will always be the result of all the punishments inflicted by the Almighty. His dealings are just the opposite of the doctrine of endless misery—and such an awful doctrine cannot be the doctrine of Christ, which breathes peace on earth and good will to men.

My friends I want you to reflect on these things. And I tell you that our own observation and experience, in accordance with the arguments adduced, when summed up, all go to show conclusively that the doctrine of endless misery is false, conceived in a dark and barbarous age. The fruits of man's ignorance, superstition, degradation, and cruelty, into which he had fallen.

You remember I told you this doctrine was never taught in the primitive ages of the church. It was not till the age of darkness had rendered men ignorant, superstitious, savage and cruel, that this doctrine was incorporated into the church, as a doctrine of Christianity.

In the course of my argument I have reminded you of the effects of this doctrine, to show you that it could not have arisen in the great fountain of infinite wisdom and benevolence. And that it must be at war with the nature of the only true and living God. Have we not reminded you of the fact that it has been the means of driving many to despair and madness, and many to commit suicide.

How many of the unfortunate victims confined in our

Lunatic Asylums have been brought there in consequence of the preaching of this doctrine of endless wo, which has driven reason from its throne. And yet our friend has been laboring to show that this is the peaceable doctrine of Christ and of the Bible. But we have had the happiness of maintaining the contrary. And now I am willing to leave these arguments with you. For if this discussion which I have no doubt will be faithfully reported, shall be thoroughly and candidly examined, I have no fear at all but what sufficient testimony and argument will be found to fully sustain the positions I have taken.

Now in conclusion, I remark that I verily believe that fifty years will not transpire before the doleful tidings of endless misery will not be heard in our land.

I have told you that I believed our friend Power was under conviction, and that his conviction would grow stronger and stronger, till he would be converted into the glorious light and liberty of the doctrine of the world's salvation.

I told you that some of the most eminent divines had been converted to this doctrine—and of that number many Preachers of the Methodist church, whose minds became enlightened and their faith enlarged to behold this glorious truth; and that believers were almost daily added to our church. And my friends this light will spread—the cause is onward and upward, and we bid it God speed! And what little ability we have, we shall devote to this cause. And I hope all errors and superstition, and relics of barbarism, and especially this horrible dogma of endless wo, will vanish from the world. In fact this awful sentiment has already began its journey to the shades of oblivion—and before fifty years shall pass away it will not be known. We say it is going to the tomb, and we wish it a peaceful journey there, never to rise again from the grave of forgetfulness to curse the world any more.

And now, in view of the opposite sentiments, that God is the Great Father and benefactor of us all, and of their happy effect, we can adopt the language of the poet.

"Oh would mankind but make fair truth their guide,  
 "And force the helm from prejudice and pride.  
 "Were once these maxims fixed that God 's cur friend,  
 "Virtue our good, and happiness our end;  
 "How soon would reason o'er the world prevail,  
 "And pride and fraud and superstition fail.  
 "None hereafter with groundless fear would accuse,  
 "The Almighty of being cruel and severe,  
 "As favoring sects, or nations, men or times,  
 "But our own and other's good, would each hour employ,  
 "And all things smile with universal joy."

[MR. POWER'S TWENTIETH AND CLOSING SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Judges.* — I am somewhat gratified that the gentleman had a scrap of poetry to fill up the time. It was as convenient for him, as a sentence sometimes is for a printer to fill out his column.

I have a few passing remarks to make before entering on the main review.

First respecting the gentleman's prophesy which he has reiterated, that in fifty years the dogma of endless perdition to the wicked will not be tolerated in the Church.— Probably a few present will live to see whether he is a true or a false prophet. I will give the congregation a few facts with reference to the signs of the times that they may judge.

A few years ago, Universalists stood out before the public challenging discussion almost from morning till noon, and from noon till night. Now the gospel we preach is a gospel of peace. And we do not willingly go to war. But Universalists cried "Orthodoxy is afraid to come into combat, they know the weakness of their positions, and are afraid of us," till this began to have considerable influence on many who were ignorant of the true character of the system and we have finally taken the field. And what is the result? Why, already they begin to cry quarters! persecution, &c. And it is like bringing culprits to judgment now, to bring them up to their principles. These are some of the signs of the times. We discuss the subject with one and when they see that he is refuted, they say "he was not so well prepared for the work, but there are

others who can maintain the doctrine against all opposition." Well we meet others again, and we are referred to some others who are able fully and triumphantly to defend the system. So we can never get to the right one who can defend the doctrine. Hence the signs of the times are that in ten or twelve years, it will be almost impossible to get an intelligent Universalist into discussion, on fair and honorable principles, that will fully develop the system. If you attempt it, they will cry persecution! persecution!!

The gentleman has raised the inquiry who can pray for the doctrine of endless misery? I would ask him if he can pray for the immortality of Deity? No, because it is not a subject of prayer. No one would pray for the endless duration of heaven, or no one but an idiot, because it is not a subject of prayer. No one would pray for the truth of the existence of electric fluid; for it already exists. And it is equally true, that such a thing as God's moral government exists, and that all will be rewarded under it according to their works, the righteous shall have eternal life and the wicked eternal death, or suffer endless misery; but these facts which have an unchanging existence are not matters of prayer but of faith.

We now pass to a review of the whole argument. We have had occasion before to mention the gentleman's mode of warfare—that he has traveled over much of his affirmative, instead of responding to mine, and consequently makes it necessary for me to go back and glance at his position on his affirmative. I shall confine my review to three points.

I. Notice the prominent positions in which the gentleman left his affirmative.

II. Present you with the strength of his arguments and proofs against my affirmative.

III. Give you the cardinal proofs and arguments in support of my affirmative.

*First.* The position in which the gentleman's affirmative was left when we closed the first question.

It is a matter of importance that you understand this, that you may be able to compare the relative clearness of

the two questions, and the relative strength of the proof on which these questions rest for their eternal duration.

It was conceded in the outset by my friend that man is a depraved and unholy being,—that he is practically depraved, wicked and rebellious. And it was also conceded that no individual can enjoy God and heaven without being made holy. You will recollect that in prosecuting his affirmative he was brought up to this point. We adduced the cases of men of different countries who left the world in a moment unholy. 1st. The case of the twenty three thousand Israelites who fell at one time in the wilderness under the frowns of Jehovah. 2nd. The thousands and tens of thousands of infidels, atheists, prostitutes and the most corrupt beings of our race, who were sent into eternity suddenly, either by their own hands, or by the hands of the assassin, in France. 3d. The battle of New Orleans. At which the British commander, as it is reported, promised the soldiery if they would take the city, as a reward of their bravery, the city and especially the females of the city should be given into their hands. But through the interpositions of Providence in favor of right and female innocence and virtue, the soldiers, while their hearts were burning with lust and crime, in whole ranks were instantly hurried into eternity. In reference to all these cases we asked the gentleman if they went into the eternal world in a state of moral purity fit for heaven? And you remember he was compelled to answer No. They left the world in a state of depravity and unholiness. We then asked him if they went into heaven in that state of corruption and unholiness? He said No. Again, if they were in a state of consciousness,—personal, individual, conscious existence, in the future world? To this he answered Yes.

Here then according to his own showing, and in accordance with matter of fact, men do enter into the future world unholy and unfit for heaven; and with this unholy character they never can enter heaven. And there must be a change wrought in them from sin to holiness before they can enter heaven. This cannot be wrought in this world: for they have already passed the bounds of time.

Where now does his position stand? You will recollect that in the commencement of the discussion he staked his whole system on the change that is to take place in the resurrection. You remember his reiterated reference. "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written 'Death is swallowed up in victory.'" "Then," says the gentleman, "all moral defilement shall be taken away from every individual of our race, and all will be fitted for heaven, all be equal unto the angels, and be made the children of God being the children of the resurrection, and not subject to death any more." Now on this point, beyond all doubt, he is either correct or incorrect as to the final moral change that is to take place in the resurrection. If he is correct in this position on which he staked his whole system, and said if it is not proved by this, it could not be proved from the Bible, then it follows that all men and women, according to his own showing, that have died unreconciled to God, cannot enter heaven till the resurrection change. Consequently, according to his own admission and in accordance with matter of fact, some have been for ages, and are still suffering misery in the future world. Here is in fact, the whole strength of the gentleman's system. Being sorely pressed with the difficulty, he virtually rejected the whole argument based on the resurrection. He said that God could in three or five minutes after death effect a change in the soul as well as before death. This, we say, to the endless disgrace of his system is an actual abandonment of the acknowledged strongest proof to be found in the Bible, proof in reference to which he has said, if it did not prove his system no other proof under heaven could. But allowing him the benefit of abandoning this his strongest position, and resting his system on the power of God to effect the change in another way, we asked him to put his finger on a single declaration of God's word, that says or gives

the least intimation that a man dying in crime and lust and atheism and suicide, in five minutes after he is dead will be morally changed, sanctified and taken to heaven. Such a declaration cannot be produced—it is not in the Bible. Then his whole system rests on a bare assumption, without the least shadow of proof to sustain it. After admitting that men die in the depths of depravity go into eternity unholy with hearts full of lust and crime, and that they cannot enter heaven in this state, he then rests his whole system on the bare assumption, which, no declaration of God's word will give the least shadow of support, that God may in three minutes after they are dead, effect a change in the soul that fits them for heaven. And mark, here now is his strongest position, and this rests on a mere assumption.

But farther on this subject: we brought up the difficulty which cannot be surmounted—allowing his position to be correct, that in the resurrection all are subjects of this moral change. The sacred Scriptures everywhere represent Jesus Christ as the personal agent in the resurrection change. This is a doctrine that none but an infidel will deny—that Jesus Christ will raise the dead. But what position does the gentleman occupy on this point? His system denies the uncreated divinity of Jesus Christ. Mr. Ballou says that he has proved that Jesus Christ is a created and dependent being. And all the standard Universalist authors maintain that Christ is a finite created being. And when I asked the gentleman if Christ is a created or uncreated being? he refused to give an answer. But we charged home on his system that it holds that He is a created finite being; and he did not deny it. We maintained—and he did not controvert it—and no other man possessed of common intelligence will for a moment controvert it,—*that nothing short of omnipotence can raise the dead.*—The fact that the Prophets and Apostles raised persons to life that had died, has nothing to do with this point: for they came up with the same bodies with which they died—not with the resurrection body.

We state the points briefly. (1st.) The whole system of Universalism depends on the power that will be exer-

ted in the resurrection of the dead. (2d.) The Bible maintains that no power but that of Christ will be exerted in raising the dead. (3d.) The system maintains that Jesus Christ is a created and finite being. And, (4th.) nothing short of *Almighty power* can raise the dead.—Then it follows with all the force of demonstration, that ever if Jesus Christ raises the dead, it must be by the omnipotent power of Jehovah, delegated to him. But it is impossible that there should be two separate omnipotent beings, and impossible for God to delegate His omnipotence and at the same time keep it himself; hence, in delegating His omnipotence to Jesus Christ, He changes from an infinite to a finite being, and ceases to be God; and hence, we are landed in absolute atheism! This is one of the strong pillars of the gentleman's system.

Again: the gentleman reserved his proofs on his question, to bring up on my affirmative, thinking, doubtless, as we intimated at the time, that he could have better success in firing upon his theological enemy from ambush, than in the open field. But, unfortunately for him, we fully understood his whole ground and manner of attack. And it created no alarm, only we had to turn aside and meet these side shots as they came along. And, in meeting this singular position of our opponent, we presented you with this view of it—that by no fair interpretation of the Bible can it possibly be made to sustain a system that releases men from all possible moral obligation in this world—from the necessity of faith, of reformation, of obedience, of love to God and man, of holiness, and announces to him that although he has to be holy before he can enter heaven in the future world, yet it is impossible for him, by the utmost exertion of all his powers both physical and mental, in all crime from birth till death, to keep himself out of heaven; but if he dies in all the moral pollution and crime conceivable, God will in some way, in three minutes after death, or at some other time, effect in him a change from sin to holiness, and take him to heaven. We assert that the word of God can never sustain such a position. But the gentleman's system does maintain this. Therefore, the Bible can never in whole or in part sustain the system of Universalism.



We will just remark here, in reference to what has been said by Mr. D. about handing me over into the hand of Mr. Loring, to answer for the charge, which in substance I have just stated, against Universalism, that he has taken the matter entirely out of his friend's hand. It has not been forgotten that on the Sabbath, in the presence of probably six hundred persons, he admitted specifically the whole charge. And he has virtually, and almost in so many words, at different times, fully admitted that men cannot, by all they can do, commit crime enough to keep them out of heaven; which is the charge I have made; so that he has relieved his friend from the task of attempting to prove my charge false. Why, this is the whole sum and substance of his system; and to deny the charge is to give up Universalism.

*Second.* We will now notice the gentleman's strong positions in opposition to our affirmative. You will recollect his main position here is, that the general judgment and final retribution of man are confined wholly and exclusively to this world. In support of this his strongest proofs were, (1st.) "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting." Against this, we maintained that the retribution, both to him that soweth to the flesh and him that soweth to the spirit, which this text teaches, is either final, and all that will ever be awarded to the one or the other, or it is not. This statement was so clear that even a child could understand it. We showed that if he that sowed to the spirit reaps life everlasting exclusively in this world, if he entered heaven at all, it would be without everlasting life!

In like manner we disposed of his quotation from Prov., "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner"—that if the righteous received all his reward in this world, the full recompense absolutely, he gains nothing by going to heaven, for he can have no more there! The gentleman, up to his last argument, and his poetry into the bargain, never touched these arguments, and they stand against him now, as unanswerable truth. The next effort that he made, was

to avoid the force of our argument on the case of Job.—He maintained that Job's being blessed in his last days, proved that the righteous are fully recompensed in the earth. The report will give the argument as it was, and if it ever comes before the public it will show that all the arguments that have been used by Mr. Doolittle might have been brought up in four hours. In reference to this case, we showed that if he maintained that the blessings Job received, proved that he was fully rewarded for his righteousness in the earth—that if the fact that Job had a wife and "fair daughters"—whose names the gentleman proceeded to give us—and sheep, and camels, and oxen, &c., was proof that he was approved of God; on the same principle he must admit that every man possessed of these things gives sure proof that he is a pious man, and one whom God approves; but this is contradicted by a thousand facts. We quoted Christ's words, "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven"—and showed that he makes Christ exhort christians to lay up sheep, and oxen, and asses, in heaven. And we assured you that no man of intelligence and learning, such as my friend is, would peril his reputation before a community, by maintaining such a position, unless he was driven into it by the depravity of his system. And yet this is one of his strong points in opposition to our affirmative!

Again: there are four distinct positions in refutation of the gentleman's negative arguments, which he has never touched. Mark that, gentlemen.

1st. His position in opposition to my affirmative contradicts the plain word of God. He acknowledged a universal judgment. And the Bible is as explicit as language can be, that Jesus Christ is to be the judge in the general judgment; and this the gentleman did not deny. But this world was in existence four thousand years before Christ had a being, according to his system. Therefore, as the judgment is in this world, he never could have judged those who lived at any time during the four thousand years before he came into existence, in the world. But, as the Bible teaches us that Jesus Christ is the judge of the whole world—of every individual of our race, the

gentleman's system contradicts the word of God; for the system says that the world was not judged, during its first four thousand years, by Christ, because He was not then in existence. But this is one of his strong points of opposition.

2d. Our next argument. But, sirs, the bird of night would as soon come forth at mid-day, to gaze at the sun, as the gentleman to look this argument in the face. We showed that it is but little less than profanity, to say that Jesus Christ could be the judge of the world, *now* administering the final judgment to every individual of the human race, fixing their destiny in eternity, and *now* be our Mediator before the throne. Mediator and judge at the same moment of time, and to the same persons, is an absurdity, and an utter impossibility that the Bible can never countenance. Mr. Doolittle might as well attempt to meet, unarmed, the lion of the forest, as to meet this argument.

3d. Another point he has not touched is, the finite character of Jesus Christ, which the system maintains throughout. Then the system has to hold this absurdity—this impossibility, that the judgment is administered all over this rolling ball, to every individual, by a finite being!—We maintain, if Jesus Christ be a finite being, it is absolutely impossible for him to be in America, in Asia, and Africa, and in every other part of this globe at the same time. It is absurd to maintain such a thing. [Mr. Doolittle here interrupted, and asked if Mr. Power meant to make the congregation believe that he had maintained that Jesus Christ was a finite being.] We say that Universalism, and its most approved authors, maintain that Jesus Christ is a finite being. And we proposed the question to the gentleman if he maintained it, and he refused to answer as an honorable disputant. I protest against his interrupting me in my closing speech. It is too late for him now. He has had ample time to review every inch of ground that I have taken, and especially this, as the question was fairly proposed to him. But, if Mr. Doolittle will say before this assembly that I misrepresent him here, and that he does believe in the unoriginated divinity of Christ, I give you notice it is because I have turned him off from his whole platform of Universalism. And I will prove

this by his own standard authors, if not by his own writings. We tell you this is a point that Universalists dare not look at. And Mr. Doolittle is not the first man that has been thrown into difficulty and consternation on this point.

4th. The gentleman staked his whole system on the resurrection. And the Bible teaches that the resurrection is inseparably connected with Christ's coming to judge the world. But his system maintains that Jesus Christ came to judge the world eighteen hundred years ago.—Then the resurrection either took place at that time or it is yet future. If the resurrection is yet future, then the judgment is yet future. This position the gentleman dared not to touch, and the difficulty still lies against him in all its force.

*Third.* I will now glance at the proof adduced on my affirmative.

The infinite perfections and wisdom of Deity, saw fit to create man an intelligent subject of moral government, and to place him under a government adapted to his nature in this world. And this system of government holds man accountable to eternity, for his moral character in this world.

1. The moral government of God, as revealed in the Bible, promises blessings to the pious that cannot be fully enjoyed in this world, and threatens privation and misery to the wicked that cannot be fully experienced in this world, and of absolute necessity must extend into the future world. We quoted a number of texts in proof of this position. Among others, this: "And fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." This, we contended, has reference to the future world. The gentleman undertook to avoid its force by making out that the Savior did not exhort his disciples to fear God, but a civil power. He paraphrased it, "Fear not them—the minor civil powers—that have power only to kill the body, but rather fear the highest civil authority, the Sanhedrim, that has power to destroy both the animal life and the body, in gehenna." Making the Savior

give this ridiculous warning to his disciples, not to fear those who could take their life, but to fear that civil power that could dispose of the body after it is dead. Such a position no man would take, unless compelled to it to save a sinking system.

2. I showed that the only condition by which the sinner could obtain pardon for his sins, and eternal life in heaven, and avoid the misery of hell, was faith that works by love and purifies the heart. On this point God has either forbidden faith as a condition of salvation in this and the future world, or he is perfectly indifferent to it, or he has required it of man as a condition of present and future salvation. But as we cannot suppose he would forbid faith in man or be indifferent to it, the conclusion is resistless that he has commanded it. This argument the gentleman passed without a solitary notice.

3. We showed that as God had revealed his will to man, and the manner in which evil can be avoided and good secured, in perfect harmony with the perfections of His nature, God holds man responsible to a future and final judgment and retribution for the use, or abuse of his powers and privileges in this world. We have laid down a principle in the interpretation of the word of God, to wit: Any interpretation of the Scriptures that contradicts matters of fact, and the whole tenor of the Scripture, and involves a contradiction, and absurdity, is absolutely false. We then showed that the gentleman's interpretation of the Scripture, in reference to the general judgment, on this principle, is false. We quoted numerous texts to show that the Bible connects circumstances and facts, with the final coming of Christ that never have taken place in the history of our race, are not now taking place, and consequently must be future, or the Bible proves a failure, and infidelity must triumph. Under this head, we adduced the proof that the coming of Christ for final judgment and retribution, is with all the holy angels, (not Roman soldiers) in the glory of his Father, personally and visibly to all the inhabitants of the earth. God's veracity is pledged that he shall come "*in like manner*" as he ascended, after his resurrection. And when he comes in this

manner, he shall reward *every man* according to his works. We showed you, too, that in connection with this literal and visible coming of Christ, the literal world would be burned up—"the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burnt up." Also, that in connection with this coming, He will change the living and raise the dead, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt—that the dead, small and great, shall stand before God. And that, in connection with this solemn and awful coming of Jesus Christ literally and visibly in the clouds of heaven, in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels, all nations, all men, all angels, good and bad, every intelligent spirit, being and subject in God's universe—none so obscure as to be overlooked, none so dignified as to be exempt—all—the first nation on earth and the last that will remain, not two or three, but *all* nations, including every individual of every nation that ever has existed or ever will exist to the end of time—all shall appear together at the bar of God, there to render a strict account for every deed and for every word, and to be judged and receive their eternal destiny according to their moral character. He will then separate all nations, every individual of every nation, according to their moral character, whether formed under greater or less light, whether Jew or Gentile, the good on one hand and the bad on the other, and the righteous shall hear the joyful invitation—"come ye blessed of my Father inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," while on the other hand, the wicked who lived and died in the rejection of all offered mercies, at enmity to God, will hear the awful sentence—"Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels."

4. And, gentlemen, we showed you that the very same language that God's unerring wisdom has employed to denote the duration of the holiness and happiness of the sanctified in heaven, is that employed by the same wisdom to describe the duration of the misery of the wicked in the future world. The Bible employs the very same language

to denote the duration of the misery of the wicked that it uses to denote the endless existence of Jehovah. And the very same argument that would limit the duration of the misery of the damned, would limit the duration of the happiness of the righteous—disrobe Deity of the attribute of eternity, and finally blot Him out of existence, and turn the universe into an eternal chaos.

5. A few remarks on the point made by our friend.—He would make the impression that, to prove the endless punishment of the finally impenitent, we have to find a *local* place or prison, and a literal lake of fire that will endure without end to apply the term *everlasting* to, then it would be of some use to us in the argument. This is the sophistry resorted to by all who attempt to maintain the system we are opposing. And when we exposed the absurdity, and showed that punishment is not *based on locality of place*, but on the *conscious existence* and *immortality* of the soul, he was greatly surprised, that the mere fiction he had set up for us was blown into oblivion by the breath of truth. And Mr. Doolittle is not the only one that has been mortified by the exposure of this sophistry.

This false argument, for which so much is claimed by Universalists, derives all its apparent plausibility from one of two assumptions: First, that punishment is an abstract principle, and *as such*, must be proved to have an endless existence, before a step is gained in proving the everlasting punishment of those who die unholy. The error, not to say absurdity, lies in claiming for suffering or punishment an *abstract* existence, when in fact, it has of absolute necessity but a *relative* existence; and can be found nowhere in the Universe but in connection with some being susceptible of pain. But a moments candid reflection is sufficient to satisfy any honest intelligent mind of this fact.

But secondly, the more general assumption is, that punishment depends on locality of place. Hence the cry "prove a *endless* hell, prison, lake, fire, &c., to put sinners into or you fail of proving endless misery for the wicked." You have heard Mr. D's demands on this subject. And there but too much reason to fear that not a few have been

alured by the delusive cry into that misery, the existence of which they deny.

To expose this error, we have only to deny the assumption, and oppose to it matters of fact, of which the world is full. Namely, that neither happiness, nor misery depends for existence on locality, but on the susceptibility of man to enjoy happiness or suffer pain. Local circumstances, as a mere contingency, may increase, or diminish pain or happiness; but take away man's susceptibility and all the localities and circumstances in the universe, could never produce the one or the other. For instance, take the man who is suffering bodily pain, and translate him to any locality in the world, and while his sensibility, and the cause of the pain remain in his physical nature, he will still be a sufferer, independent of all local situation.

And furthermore, let disease result in temporal death; and if there was no power superior to his own to effect his resurrection, he would remain *endlessly* the subject of this death, independent absolutely, of all locality of place.—And the same is true of our mental nature, and of our moral and spiritual sufferings and death. Take the man who is unholy, living in unbelief, and in rebellion against God—his carnal mind is enmity against God, and being morally dead, in trespasses and in sin, he is unhappy. But does his misery or punishment depend on locality of place or external circumstances? So far from it, that in the midst of the splendors of the palace and the applause of “a thousand lords,” with a scepter in his hand, an empire at his feet, and the world ministering to his happiness like a Belshazzar, under a consciousness of guilt he trembles at the “writing upon the wall.” So far then is it from being true, that the punishment of the wicked depends for its existence on locality of place or circumstance, that these things have no necessary connection with it whatever. You see therefore that the facts in the case are,—the punishment of the sinner includes first, his susceptibility of mental pain or suffering; and secondly, the depravity and guilt of his heart. Thus destitute, morally, of the image, the life, the communion of God in his heart, he must be unhappy at any point or place in



God's universe. And if he passes out of this life into the future world, thus spiritually and morally "dead in trespasses and in sins," he enters upon the "second death," or a state of anguish and suffering. And this "second death," you see, does not depend on locality or place, or external circumstances, but on the moral and spiritual nature and character of the sinner. He has in his own soul the "worm that never dieth, and the fire that is never quenched." And now there are but two points at which it is possible to attempt to escape the conclusion—the endless misery of those who leave this world unholy. Either to prove that they are *morally changed* and made *holy* after death, and in the future world, or to deny the immortality of the soul.

But where is the proof of this moral change after death? The advocates of Universalism have been challenged from the time they first uttered this dangerous and unscriptural dogma, to produce one single declaration from the word of God to show that sinners are thus reformed and morally changed in the future world, but they have utterly failed. One such text would forever settle this controversy, and secure a universal triumph for the system.

Seeing the achievement would be so splendid for Universalism, why is not the proof adduced? For this invincible reason, it is not in the Bible. And if the Bible be true, it is not in the universe. And its advocates are found pleading with men to peril their eternal interests on the corrupt dogmas of the system, not only in the absence of every particle of proof from the Scriptures, but directly in the face of the authority of that holy record.

Fearful responsibility indeed! Who will be able meet it at the judgment bar of God?

It is true, Mr. Doolittle tried to show that such a reformatory change will take place at the resurrection. But you all recollect his signal failure. He did not satisfy himself, nor any one else with the attempt. Recollecting doubtless, his admissions that thousands of our race have gone into eternity depraved and unholy, and if no change is effected till the resurrection, they must suffer future punishment for ages, which would utterly ruin his sys-

tem, he abandoned his ground and endeavored to fix this moral change immediately after death. But what evidence did he bring that such is the fact? Not a particle, above his own bare assertion! While we showed that after death *saving faith* is absolutely *impossible*; and that the wrath of God *abideth on him* that is in *unbelief*, as long as he is in that moral state. But he must continue in that moral state, while he has a being, for faith that saves from sin, or justifies, is impossible in the future world, therefore his condition morally, is unchangeable, and his punishment must last as long as his existence.

And now as we have shown that the punishment of the wicked is based on, and has its existence in the susceptibility, depravity, and consequent *conscious guilt* of the soul, and not necessarily on locality or place, or external circumstances, and that a moral change from sin to holiness after death is, according to the Bible, absolutely impossible, it follows beyond all evasion, that the time of the sinner's punishment in the eternal world, can be limited only by the duration of his existence. Hence there is no alternative but to deny the *immortality* of the soul, or admit, according to the doctrine of the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, the *endless punishment* of the finally impenitent, in a state of immortality in the eternal world.

But God has stamped *immortality* upon the intellectual constitution and nature of man, but man has corrupted that nature, with depravity and sin, and in the abuse of heaven's best gifts, has kindled a fire in his own soul, which, if not extinguished in this life under the provisions of the love of God, in an application of the atoning blood of Christ by the Holy Spirit, will in the future world constitute his "hell,"—the "lake of fire," the "eternal fire," the "fire that shall never be quenched," the undying "worm," the "second death," HIS ENDLESS PUNISHMENT IN ETERNITY. We now close, and leave you to decide on the proofs and arguments adduced.

We return our acknowledgments to the community, for the orderly and serious manner in which they have attended this discussion throughout. And should we never see you again in time, we exhort you to prepare for eter-

nity, that we may meet in heaven. In regard to my opponent I regret to say, that he has indulged in more discourteous personalities, than any one I have discussed this subject with. However, I will excuse him, and charge them upon the depravity of his system.

To you Gentlemen Judges, we return our thanks for the patient and impartial manner in which you have discharged your duties; and we hope to remember your best interests in our supplications before the throne of heavenly grace.



1



*Acme*

Bookbinding Co., Inc.  
300 Summer Street  
Boston, Mass. 02210



3 2044 069 599 579

The borrower must return this item on or before the last date stamped below. If another user places a recall for this item, the borrower will be notified of the need for an earlier return.

*Non-receipt of overdue notices does not exempt the borrower from overdue fines.*

**Andover-Harvard Theological Library**  
**Cambridge, MA 02138 617-495-5788**

**Please handle with care.**  
**Thank you for helping to preserve**  
**library collections at Harvard.**



